

The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel

Biblical Interpretation Series

Editors-in-Chief

Paul Anderson (*George Fox University*)
Jennifer L. Koosed (*Albright College, Reading*)

Editorial Board

A. K. M. Adam (*University of Oxford*)
Colleen M. Conway (*Seton Hall University*)
Amy Kalmanofsky (*Jewish Theological Seminary*)
Vernon Robbins (*Emory University*)
Annette Schellenberg (*Universität Wien*)
Johanna Stiebert (*University of Leeds*)
Duane Watson (*Malone University*)
Christine Roy Yoder (*Columbia Theological Seminary*)
Ruben Zimmermann (*Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz*)

VOLUME 167

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/bins*

The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel

Intertextuality and Interpretation

By

William G. Fowler
Michael Strickland



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Fowler, William G., editor. | Strickland, Michael, 1974– editor. |
Fowler, William G. Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel.
Title: The influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel : intertextuality and
interpretation / edited by William G. Fowler, Michael Strickland.
Description: Boston : Brill, 2018. | Series: Biblical interpretation series,
ISSN 0928-0731 ; volume 167 | Thesis (Ph. D.)—Golden Gate Baptist
Theological Seminary, 1995. Revised and updated by original author
William G. Fowler and additional author/editor Michael Strickland. |
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2018036417 (print) | LCCN 2018038128 (ebook) |
ISBN 9789004383845 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004383814 (hardback : alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Bible. John—Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Bible.
John—Relation to Ezekiel. | Bible. Ezekiel—Relation to John. |
Intertextuality in the Bible.
Classification: LCC BS2615.52 (ebook) | LCC BS2615.52 .I644 2018 (print) |
DDC 226.5/06—dc23
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018036417>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: “Brill”. See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0928-0731
ISBN 978-90-04-38381-4 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-38384-5 (e-book)

Copyright 2018 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi, Brill Sense,
Hotei Publishing, mentis Verlag, Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh and Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise,
without prior written permission from the publisher.
Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided
that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive,
Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Preface IX

Acknowledgements X

Abbreviations XI

1 Introduction 1

- 1 In Search of the Background to the Fourth Gospel 3
- 2 Intertextuality and Interpretation 7
- 3 The Johannine Community and Ezekiel 11
- 4 Prior Research into the Inter-relatedness of Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel 14
- 5 Critical Issues 17
 - 5.1 *Authorship* 17
 - 5.2 *Relationship to the Apocalypse* 18
 - 5.3 *Unity and Order of Composition* 18
 - 5.4 *Historicity* 19
- 6 Methodology 19
- 7 Presentation 21

2 The Theological Vocabularies of John and Ezekiel 24

- 1 Words Used by John Fifty Times or More 27
 - 1.1 *Father* 28
 - 1.2 *Believe* 29
 - 1.3 *Know* 30
 - 1.4 *World* 32
 - 1.5 *Send* 34
 - 1.6 *Hear* 35
 - 1.7 *Love* 36
 - 1.8 *Life* 38
- 2 Words Used in the "I Am" Sayings 40
 - 2.1 *Bread* 41
 - 2.2 *Light* 42
 - 2.3 *Door* 43
 - 2.4 *Shepherd* 45
 - 2.5 *Resurrection* 46
 - 2.6 *Way* 47
 - 2.7 *Truth* 48
 - 2.8 *Vine* 49

3	Other Significant Words and Phrases	49
3.1	<i>Word</i>	50
3.2	<i>Witness</i>	53
3.3	<i>Glory</i>	54
3.4	<i>Judgment</i>	56
3.5	<i>Water</i>	58
3.6	<i>Spirit</i>	60
3.7	<i>Signs</i>	63
4	Conclusions	66
3	Primary Points of Contact	67
1	The New Temple	67
1.1	<i>The Replacement, or Embodiment, of Judaism?</i>	68
1.2	<i>Jewish Expectations</i>	70
1.3	<i>Ezekiel's New Temple</i>	71
1.4	<i>Jesus as the New Temple</i>	75
1.5	<i>Parallels</i>	82
1.6	<i>Conclusions and Implications</i>	83
2	Rivers of Living Water	84
2.1	<i>The Feast of Tabernacles</i>	85
2.2	<i>Punctuation and Antecedent of αὐτοῦ</i>	86
2.3	<i>Scripture Citation</i>	87
2.4	<i>Conclusions and Implications</i>	88
3	The Good Shepherd	89
3.1	<i>The Setting of John 10</i>	89
3.2	<i>Old Testament Imagery</i>	91
3.3	<i>Ezekiel's Shepherd</i>	91
3.4	<i>The Good Shepherd in John's Gospel</i>	92
3.5	<i>Comparisons and Conclusions</i>	93
4	The Resurrection	95
4.1	<i>Chapter 5 as Precedent to Chapter 11</i>	96
4.2	<i>The Resurrection and the Life, John 11</i>	98
4.3	<i>Ezek 37 and the Valley of Dry Bones</i>	100
4.4	<i>Comparisons and Conclusions</i>	102

4	Secondary Points of Contact	104
1	Born of Water and Spirit	104
2	Son of Man	109
3	Paraclete	112
4	“Die in Your Sins”	114
5	“I Have Glorified It” [My Name]	114
6	The Christ Remains Forever	115
7	I Will Do It	116
8	The True Vine	117
9	The One Hundred Fifty-Three Fish	118
10	Conclusion	121
5	Conclusion	122
1	Hays’ Criteria and Evidence of Intertextuality	122
1.1	<i>Availability</i>	122
1.2	<i>Volume</i>	122
1.3	<i>Recurrence</i>	123
1.4	<i>Thematic Coherence</i>	124
1.5	<i>Historical Plausibility</i>	124
1.6	<i>History of Interpretation</i>	125
1.7	<i>Satisfaction</i>	125
2	Conclusions Regarding Influence	126
3	Value for Interpretation	127
	Bibliography	131
	Books and Commentaries	131
	Articles and Essays	140
	Unpublished Works	147
	Index of Subjects and Modern Authors	148
	Index of Scripture and Other Ancient Writings	150

Preface

The purpose of the study is to demonstrate the influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel by identifying and evaluating intertextual links between the two texts. Chapter 1 introduces the study, provides its parameters, and identifies features that may be regarded as evidence of intertextuality.

The theological vocabularies of John and Ezekiel are examined in Chapter 2 to discover possible points of contact. Words used by John fifty times or more, words used in the “I am” sayings, and other words significant to John’s theology are compared to Ezekiel. Significant contact appears with the words hear, know, send, word, spirit, water, and shepherd.

Chapters 3 and 4 set forth primary and secondary points of contact between Ezekiel and John. Primary points include the new Temple, the living water, the Good Shepherd, and being “born from above.” Secondary points include the figures Son of man, Paraclete, and True Vine, along with various phrases that may owe some debt to Ezekiel’s influence. The majority of these have been observed by other authors. The chief contribution of this study is to bring them all together and show Ezekiel as an important influence on John’s presentation of Jesus.

Richard Hays’ criteria for evaluating evidence of intertextuality are used in chapter 5 to assess the evidence set forth in chapters 2–4. We conclude that the Fourth Gospel reveals a strong intertextual relationship with Ezekiel at several points. When taken into account, these links are a valuable resource for the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel’s witness to Jesus. As such, the study underscores the continuing need for historical-critical research alongside the more modern critical methods of interpretation.

Acknowledgements

My initial research into the influence of Ezekiel on the Gospel of John was undertaken at the encouragement of Dr. Clayton K. Harrop during my M.Div. studies in the early 1980s. When I returned to Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary ten years later to work on a Ph.D. under Harrop's watchful eye, I was drawn back to the theme and was delighted when he granted approval. It is impossible to adequately acknowledge the debt owed to Harrop for his guidance throughout the process of research and writing. Plunging immediately into a pastorate, thoughts of publication were remote at best. Almost twenty years later I was contacted by Brian Neil Peterson requesting a copy to consult as he researched what became his *John's Use of Ezekiel: Understanding the Unique Perspective of the Fourth Gospel*, Fortress, 2015. Grateful for the interest in my work I immediately granted access. When published, Peterson spoke appreciatively on the value of my earlier research. I was ecstatic. What could be better? The better turned out to be contact from Michael Strickland offering to partner with me to edit and update the research (over twenty years of scholarship), and to seek publication. What you hold in your hand is a dream come true, albeit a dream I was never bold enough to imagine. I must acknowledge my deep gratitude to Harrop for guidance in the original composition, to Peterson for highlighting its value, and to Strickland for taking a twenty-year old piece of research and bringing it into the 21st century. And somewhere there is a scholar who reviewed this work for Brill and highly recommended its publication. Whoever you were, your words blessed the heart of one who took this challenge on years ago as a labor of love for the prophet Ezekiel and the evangelist John. Thank you, one and all!

Bill Fowler

It has been a joy working with Bill Fowler in getting this monograph ready for publication. While he has graciously agreed to allow me to be listed as co-author, he is responsible for the lion's share of the scholarship found here. I was blessed to be able to update his important work done on the subject of John's relationship to Ezekiel. I am sincerely grateful that he allowed me to join him in this venture. I am also thankful to my colleagues at Amridge University, who have given me the support and encouragement to pursue biblical scholarship. Of course, I am grateful to my wife, Mary, and our children, Helen, Lila Beth, and Charlie, for their love and patience as I spend countless hours researching and writing. *Soli Deo gloria!*

Michael Strickland

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
BibSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CQR	<i>Church Quarterly Review</i>
DOTT	<i>Documents of Old Testament Times</i> . D. Winton Thomas, ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.
DJ	<i>Durham University Journal</i>
EBib	Études Bibliques
EBC	Expositor's Bible Commentary
EQ	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
ExpTim	<i>Expository Times</i>
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HSMS	Harvard Semitic Monograph Series
IB	Interpreter's Bible
IBS	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
ITC	International Theological Commentary
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
JAAR	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	JBL Monograph Series
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTS S	Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
MT	Masoretic Text
NCB	New Century Bible
Neot	<i>Neotestamentica</i>

NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PTR</i>	<i>Princeton Theological Review</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
SBLDS	Society for Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SN	Studia Neotestamentica
SNTS DS	Society of New Testament Studies Dissertation Series
SNTS MS	Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
<i>TR</i>	<i>Theological Review</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>TrinJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum, Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Introduction

If we attend to the way that Scripture actually functions in John, we will see that the identity of Jesus is deeply embedded in Israel's texts and traditions.... This is the world in which John's imagination is immersed; it is impossible to understand John's Jesus apart from the story of Israel and the liturgical festivals and symbols that recall and re-present that story.¹

Students of the New Testament have often observed distinct evidence of Ezekiel's influence in the Apocalypse of John.² A substantial body of literature has been published exploring and expounding upon that evidence.³ However, while intertextual relations between the Apocalypse and Ezekiel have been readily acknowledged, connections with the Fourth Gospel have only begun to be explored in the past fifteen years.⁴ The prophecies of Ezekiel have largely been viewed as an apocalyptic resource with the result that the relationship of Ezekiel to the gospels has received little attention.⁵ This study will seek to

-
- 1 Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2016), 287.
 - 2 C. Hassell Bullock observes that "there is ample consideration of this matter in the commentaries," in "Ezekiel, Bridge Between the Testaments," *JETS* 25 (1982), 23.
 - 3 Examples include: Albert Vanhoye, "L'Utilisation du Livre d'Ezechiel dans l'Apocalypse," *Biblica* 43 (1962), 436–476; Jeffery M. Vogelgesang, "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1985); Jean-Pierre M. Rutz, "Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation of Prophetic Language in Revelation 16:17–19:10" (Dissertation, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1989); Daniel C. Fredericks, "Diglossia, Revelation, and Ezekiel's Inaugural Rite," *JETS* 41 (1998): 189–99; Sverre Bøe, *Gog and Magog: Ezekiel 38–39 as a Pre-Text for Revelation 19, 17–21 and 20, 7–10* (WUNT 2/135; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001); and Beate Kowalski, "Transformation of Ezekiel in John's Revelation," in *Transforming Visions: Transformations of Text, Tradition, and Theology in Ezekiel*, ed. William A. Tooman and Michael A. Lyons (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010), 279–311. M. D. Goulder has even proposed that pericopes of the Apocalypse were purposefully written to correspond to lectionary readings of the Book of Ezekiel and the two were to be read together in worship; "The Apocalypse of John as an Annual Cycle of Prophecies," *NTS* 27 (1981), 342–367.
 - 4 The two primary monographs on this point are Gary T. Manning, *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); and Brian Neil Peterson, *John's Use of Ezekiel: Understanding the Unique Perspective of the Fourth Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press), 2015.
 - 5 Bullock, "Bridge," 23. Surprisingly, in Stanley E. Porter and Andrew K. Gabriel, eds., *Johannine Writings and Apocalyptic: An Annotated Bibliography* (Johannine Studies 1; Leiden: Brill,

remedy the lack of attention and show Ezekiel's place as an important influence upon the thought of the Fourth Evangelist.⁶

Studies of an earlier day looked to the world of Hellenism, with its cults, myths, and philosophies, to understand the thought of the Fourth Evangelist.⁷ However, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran had revealed that John was more closely aligned with Judaism as similarities in language and thought between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Fourth Gospel came to light.⁸ The pendulum had swung back toward viewing Judaism as being the primary source for the background of the Gospel.⁹ An appreciation of the Gospel as being firmly rooted in the Old Testament had been revived.

This appreciation opened possibilities with regard to the themes of the Fourth Gospel that are prevalent in the Book of Ezekiel. Is Ezekiel to be

-
- 2013), Porter and Gabriel list only three resources. Those are Johan Lust, "The Order of the Final Events in Revelation and Ezekiel," in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*, ed. J. Lambrecht (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980); Manning, *Echoes*; and Mary Katharine Deeley, "Ezekiel's Shepherd and John's Jesus: A Case Study in the Appropriation of Biblical Texts," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 252–64.
- 6 Interest in the relationship between the Book of Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel began for the primary author, William (Bill) Fowler, during the Spring semester at Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary in 1982. While studying the Gospel of John under Professor Clayton Harrop, he was, at the same time, leading his church in an in-depth study of the Book of Ezekiel as a follow up to the January Bible Study on the Book of Jeremiah. As the class discussed the issue of backgrounds to the Gospel, interest was sparked over the trend away from interpreting the Gospel in light of the cults and myths of Hellenism, and toward seeing the Gospel's background as being thoroughly rooted in Judaism and the OT. Our interest was particularly aroused when many of the motifs and themes of the Fourth Gospel were discovered in the Book of Ezekiel. Was Ezekiel to be understood as an important influence in the Fourth Gospel? Did his prophecies provide clues for interpreting certain texts in John? Permission was granted by Harrop to pursue this interest in a term paper, which became the subject of Fowler's dissertation ten years later.
- 7 Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, ed. Carl H. Kraeling (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933); Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, et al. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971); and C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953); are examples of commentators who perceived a predominantly Hellenistic background to the Fourth Gospel rather than a Jewish one.
- 8 An early article to point out parallels was W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: Studies in Honor of C. H. Dodd*, eds. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 153–171.
- 9 See Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, AB, vols. 29 and 29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966). The chapter tracing the new perspective on the background to John was "Proposed Influences on the Religious Thought of the Fourth Gospel," lii–lxvi.

understood as an important influence in the Fourth Gospel? Do his prophecies provide clues for interpreting certain texts in John? This work demonstrates close ties between the thought of the Fourth Evangelist and the prophet Ezekiel. John's presentation of Jesus in his Gospel appears to be a conscious effort to show that Jesus was the fulfillment of expectations inherent in Judaism as a whole, many of which had been generated and encouraged by the prophet Ezekiel. This study provides evidence that Ezekiel left a definite mark on the presentation of Jesus that is found in John's Gospel and that this influence is, at points, invaluable for interpreting what is found there.¹⁰

1 In Search of the Background to the Fourth Gospel

One of the basic elements of New Testament interpretation is the study of backgrounds and perhaps there is no New Testament document over which the question of backgrounds has raised more discussion than the Fourth Gospel. The title of Bacon's commentary in 1933, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, captured the basic understanding of the roots of the Fourth Gospel during the hundred-year period prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The dualistic language used in the Gospel, its emphasis on abstract ideas such as light and truth, and its concept of the World—were taken as evidence that the Fourth Gospel could not have sprung forth from the first-century, Palestinian-Jewish world of Jesus.¹¹ In many ways, Bacon's commentary was a continuation of the mid-nineteenth-century thought of F. C. Baur and others of the so-called "Tübingen school" who followed him.¹² The traditional assumption that the Fourth Gospel was written during the first century by John, the Son of Zebedee and the apostle of Jesus, was denied in favor of a late second-century date and a thoroughly Hellenistic background. A consensus of opinion eventually developed that held the Fourth Gospel was the product of Greek philosophical thought and pagan mystery religions.¹³ Various Greek sources were proposed:¹⁴ Philo, Stoicism, Greek mythology, Gnosticism (Mandaean and otherwise), and

10 So Manning, *Echoes*, and Peterson, *John's Use of Ezekiel*.

11 Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel and the Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988), 13–14.

12 See Martin Hengel, "Bishop Lightfoot and the Tübingen School on the Gospel of John and the Second Century," *DUF* (1992), 23–51.

13 Brown, *Concise Commentary*, 13–14.

14 For a discussion of the origin and the basic contours of these hypotheses see Stephen S. Smalley, *John: Interpreter and Evangelist* (Greenwood: Attic Press, 1978), 42–58.

the *Hermetica*. Prior to the discoveries at Qumran only a few scholars seriously questioned the predominance of Greek thought behind the Gospel.¹⁵

With the discovery, translation and publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls, a radical shift in opinion about the intellectual home of the Fourth Gospel took place. The Dead Sea Scrolls demonstrated that the language of the Fourth Gospel fit comfortably within the realm of first-century Palestine and there was no need to relegate it to a second century, Hellenistic environment.¹⁶ Charlesworth, a scholar committed to Dead Sea Scrolls research, has observed:

Today, 45 years later, a growing scholarly consensus finds John to be a first-century composition. More surprising still, it is perhaps the most Jewish of the Gospels. Elements that were once thought to be reflections of Greek philosophy were all there at the time in contemporaneous Palestine.¹⁷

Charlesworth attributes this shift almost exclusively to the influence of the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, the discovery of the Nag Hammadi texts has also been important.¹⁸ These texts provided a picture of Gnosticism which had previously only been pieced together from patristic sources. Studies of the Nag Hammadi material revealed a profound difference of thought between the Gnosticism of the second century and the Fourth Gospel. Brown has concluded: "The theory that John borrowed from such Gnosticism is implausible; more likely the second-century Gnostics drew from John, and not vice versa."¹⁹ As for the supposed link with the *Hermetica*, studies such as Kilpatrick's, "The

15 Edwyn C. Hoskyns, in a work begun about 1923, but completed and published posthumously by Francis N. Davey in 1940, contended that the Fourth Gospel, with its constant reference to the Hebrew Scriptures and Palestinian geography, was Jewish and not Gnostic; Edwyn C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. Francis N. Davey (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1940, 2nd. ed., 1947).

16 J. N. Sandars and B. A. Maston, *The Gospel According to St. John*, Harper's New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), 22.

17 James H. Charlesworth, "Reinterpreting John: How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Revolutionized Our Understanding of the Gospel of John," *BRev* 9 (1993), 19. Indeed, "it must be said that the state of Johannine studies has probably evolved more over the last six decades [since the discovery of the DSS] than that of any other corpus within the New Testament," according to Paul N. Anderson, "John and Qumran: Discovery and Interpretation over Sixty Years," in *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*, ed. Mary L. Coloe and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011), 15.

18 Brown, *Concise Commentary*, 15.

19 Ibid.

Religious Background of the Fourth Gospel,” have shown the same kind of reverse connection at work (the *Hermetica* drawing from the Gospel of John), if any exists at all.²⁰

The general tendency in recent decades has been to lessen the emphasis on Gnosticism and Hellenism and to focus rather on Judaism as the primary matrix from which the Gospel took its shape.²¹ Sloyan argues that Barrett was probably the last of a long line of Johannine scholars to believe that the non-Jewish elements in the Gospel predominated.²² As for the relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Scrolls of Qumran, while its exact nature is not clear, the opinion of Brown is assumed for the purposes of this study:

There is no evidence for a *direct* familiarity of John with the Dead Sea Scrolls; rather it is a question of indirect acquaintance with a type of thought and expression current at Qumran, and perhaps in a much wider area.²³

Whatever the case, the association of the Gospel with first-century Palestinian Judaism has become an acceptable position in Johannine studies.²⁴

If first-century Judaism was the intellectual home of the Gospel, the Old Testament Scriptures were a key feature of that setting. Themes found in the Fourth Gospel are often echoes, translated and enriched, of Old Testament

20 G. D. Kilpatrick, “The Religious Background of the Fourth Gospel,” in *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Limited, 1957), 36–44.

21 Thomas L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 9. Brodie is convinced that the Gospel shows “massive dependence upon Judaism,” 140.

22 Gerard S. Sloyan, *What Are They Saying About John?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 13; quotes Barrett: “When all has been reviewed it is difficult to resist the impression that the Palestinian material has been disposed according to the demands of a dominant non-Jewish partner;” from C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel of John and Judaism*, trans. by D. M. Smith (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 120.

23 Brown, *Concise Commentary*, 14. The primary author also conducted a comparative study of Johannine writings and the major published works from Qumran for a Ph. D. seminar on the Dead Sea Scrolls at Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, and reached the same conclusion as Brown. Indeed, since Brown's commentary, the importance of the DSS in Johannine studies has only become more evident, with Paul Anderson (“John and Qumran,” 19) estimating that “hundreds of books and essays [touch] on the intersections between the two fields.”

24 For a thorough discussion of John's Jewish background, see Craig Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols. (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publisher, 2003), 1.171–232.

concepts and ideas.²⁵ Brown declares that “John reflects even more clearly than the Synoptic Gospels the great currents of Old Testament thought.”²⁶ Even from Germany, where a long tradition of presuming Hellenistic influence has been the case, Schnackenburg observes: “This Gospel would be unthinkable without the O.T. basis which supports it.”²⁷ The case has been settled enough among Johannine scholars for Carson to assert:

The Fourth Gospel is full of the OT, which it treats, not primarily as a source for proof-texts, but as the foundation for all that takes place in the revelation of God in Jesus. This has been well documented, and need not be reviewed here.²⁸

Thus, the growing weight of opinion that the Old Testament is a key to interpreting the Gospel is assumed in the monograph.²⁹ We do not seek to deal with the entire problem of the background of the Fourth Gospel, nor will the study seek to demonstrate a cross-section of Old Testament motifs re-occurring in the Gospel. Instead, an investigation will be conducted to determine whether or not the Book of Ezekiel is to be accepted as an important resource for interpreting the thought of the Fourth Gospel.

-
- 25 D. Moody Smith, Jr., “The Use of the Old Testament in the New,” in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, ed. J. M. Efrid (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972), 54.
 - 26 Brown, *John*, Anchor Bible, Vol. 29, LX. See Richard Morgan, “Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations,” *Interpretation* 11 (1957), 155, who also affirms that the Old Testament is the foundation of the Fourth Gospel.
 - 27 Rudolph Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 1, trans. Kevin Smyth (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1990), 124.
 - 28 D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), 132. See also A. T. Hanson, “John’s Use of Scripture,” in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner (JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 358–79. The bibliography which demonstrates this would be quite lengthy. For an excellent discussion of the scholarship regarding the OT influence on the Fourth Gospel, see Alicia D. Myers, “Abiding Words: An Introduction to Perspectives on John’s Use of Scripture,” in *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*, ed. Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard (RBS BS 81; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 1–20.
 - 29 For an excellent case, see (esp. chapter 3 in) Saeed Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*, (WUNT 120; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

2 Intertextuality and Interpretation

Models for the interpretation of texts have been provided since ancient times.³⁰ Each one has sought to establish criteria by which texts are to be studied, explored, and understood. Vernon K. Robbins has offered a helpful interpretive model for the gospels in his *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*. He outlines what he calls a “socio-rhetorical method” of analysis as follows: “the four arenas of interest to the socio-rhetorical interpreter and critic are four kinds of texture in the text: inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, and ideological texture.”³¹ It is the second of these four arenas, the intertexture, that we focus on in this study. We investigate intertextual relationships between the Fourth Gospel and the Book of Ezekiel and suggest the implications of such connections for evaluating Ezekiel’s influence on the Fourth Gospel.

All literature has intertexture and every text is related to some other text so that no text can be understood without some appeal to other texts.³² Kristeva, who has been credited with having formulated and developed the notion of intertextuality,³³ contends that “every text builds itself as a mosaic of quotations, every text is absorption and transformation of another text.”³⁴ Likewise, Boyarin states, “Since Adam, then, all discourse is dialogue with the past and all literature is therefore intertextual and double-voiced.”³⁵ When this

30 James D. Wood, *The Interpretation of the Bible: A Historical Introduction* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd., 1958), has provided examples of interpretive models from Rabbinical Judaism (Hillel’s seven rules of interpretation which were later expanded by Ishmael into thirteen), from Christian history (Origen’s allegorical method, Augustine’s seven rules in *Christian Doctrine*, etc.), and from Greco-Roman history (the hermeneutical principles of the Stoics), to name a few.

31 By inner texture Robbins refers to the rhetorical-literary features in the text. Intertexture is the relation of texts to other texts. Social and cultural texture identifies the social dimensions of language in the text. Ideological texture relates to the aims, goals, and strategies revealed by the text. Vernon K. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*, paperback ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), xx–xxx.

32 Danna Nolan Fewell, ed., “Introduction: Writing, Reading, and Relating,” *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 17.

33 Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1981), 105. Also, according to Daniel Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990), 134, n. 44, Kristeva’s term has spawned a small library of related works.

34 Julia Kristeva, *Semiotike: Recherches pour une sémantique* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1969), 146.

35 Meaning that the Adam of Genesis would have been the only human to speak without a pre-history of discourse upon which to depend; Boyarin, *Intertextuality*, 23.

intertextuality can be identified it has the potential of making specific texts intelligible.³⁶ Strong clues into the author's meaning and intention can be ascertained where intertextual relationships are discovered.³⁷

Features which may be regarded as intertextual are: shared vocabulary, citations/quotations, allusions to earlier traditions or adaptations of earlier traditions, common motifs, and typology.³⁸ Culler would eliminate allusions and quotations from this list. He distinguishes between the traditional study of "sources and influences" and "intertextuality" by claiming that the former are specific and identifiable while the latter is characterized by anonymity and generality.³⁹ Boyarin objects to this distinction and points out that such a claim makes it impossible, by definition, to study the intertexts of a specific

36 Ibid., 135.

37 It is our conviction that capturing the original intent of an author is critical to the interpretation of texts. Robert Morgan and John Barton affirm that "the author's intention remains the norm of meaning," but also acknowledge that not all interpreters choose to respect the author's intentions. See their *Biblical Interpretation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 6–7. Some practitioners of the new literary criticism, such as Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981), discount the importance of authorial intent. Rhetorical criticism, however, has maintained a commitment to discovering the intent of the author; George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 4. Like Kennedy, we assume the validity and importance of seeking authorial intent in this study. Mark Allan Powell further argues, "A significant distinction may be drawn, however, between imposing an extraneous notion of authorial intent upon a narrative and deriving an intrinsic notion of authorial intent from a narrative. In secular literary studies, the concern was to discourage the former, not the latter. As near as I can tell, no one in the New Criticism movement denied that an author's intent *could* be discerned through literary analysis of a work, nor did anyone maintain that an author's intent *should not* be discerned through such analysis." Mark Allan Powell, "Narrative Criticism: The Emergence of a Prominent Reading Strategy," in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. Kelly R. Iverson and Christopher W. Skinner (RBS 65; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011), 27.

38 These are all forms of what Roy R. Jeal calls "oral-scribal intertexture," which "considers the more obvious intertextuality of recitations, but also takes into account recontextualizations, reconfigurations, narrative amplifications, and thematic elaborations of language observed in other texts." Roy R. Jeal, "Sociorhetorical Intertexture," in *Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*, ed. B. J. Oropeza and Steve Moyise (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2016), 152. See also Robbins, *Jesus*, xxx–xxxii; Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1991), 97; Peter D. Miscall, "Isaiah: New Heavens, New Earth, New Book," in *Reading Between Texts*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell, 41, 44; and Ilona N. Rashkow, "Intertextuality, Transference, and the Reader in/of Genesis 12 and 20," also in *Reading Between Texts*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell, 57–58.

39 Culler, *Signs*, 106.

text.⁴⁰ His matrix of intertextuality would include allusions and quotations.⁴¹ Kristeva also includes maxims and axioms.⁴² For the purposes of this study, features regarded by Robbins, Myers and Miscall as intertextual will be accepted.⁴³

Citing evidence of intertextual connections is not the same thing as claiming a strict literary dependence,⁴⁴ nor is it to be equated with the results of source criticism, though the two may be closely related.⁴⁵ The citation of intertextual evidence simply points to literature (or oral tradition⁴⁶), available to the author of the text being interpreted, which could have influenced the author at a conceptual level. Where it can be demonstrated that strong affinities between two texts exist, and that the latter text was probably influenced by the former, the use of intertextual evidence as an aid to interpretation is justified. Of course, it does not determine the interpretation, but it does provide an additional frame of reference from which to work.

A strong word of caution must be raised.⁴⁷ Not every point of shared vocabulary or common motif is to be construed as an intertextual link.⁴⁸ Supposed points of contact must be carefully evaluated and there will always be a certain

40 Boyarin, *Intertextuality*, 135.

41 Ibid.

42 Julia Kristeva, *La Revolution du langage poetique* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1974), 337–358.

43 Scholars disagree over the question of whether intertextuality is simply to be regarded as a condition of textuality, or to be considered a methodology; Richard Hillman, *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama* (London: Macmillan, 1992), 1. We believe that Michelle Fletcher has argued convincingly, as it applies to biblical texts, “intertextuality itself is not a methodology, nor even a description of specific textual practices. Rather, it is a way of describing textual relationships”; Michelle Fletcher, *Reading Revelation as Pastiche: Imitating the Past* (LNTS 571; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), 27. We regard intertextuality as a condition of the text, not as a distinct methodology of reading the text.

44 Robbins, *Jesus*, xxvi–xxvii.

45 Boyarin, *Intertextuality*, 135. Distinguishing between source-studies and intertextuality is not a simple matter. Hillman once labeled certain articles as “source-studies” which now appear as chapters in his book on intertextuality because it was the only available category at the time, *Intertextuality*, 2–3.

46 Robbins, *Jesus*, xxxii; and Miscall, “Isaiah,” 42.

47 For a discussion of the dangers and absurdities of an uncritical approach to literary parallels see Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81 (1962), 1–13.

48 A classic example of mistaking verbal similarity for an instance of intertextuality is provided in Selwyn’s commentary on 1 Peter, where a supposed link between the speeches of two statesmen, separated by over a hundred years, was merely a coincidence; Edward G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 2nd. ed. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1955), 8–9. What was regarded by one listener as evidence of literary dependence of Prime Minister Chamberlain upon the former Prime Minister Canning had an entirely different explanation.

sense in which conclusions about a text's intertextual connections remain tentative. The degree of certainty will be relative to the evidence at hand. Evidence that could be taken as conclusive would be where an author's name is mentioned, or where another text is quoted word-for-word.⁴⁹ The failure of quotations to be exact in no way denies that they are related to previous texts. Authors may be quoting from memory, translating from another language (e.g., Hebrew to Greek), or intentionally employing, and yet adapting, an earlier tradition. The intertextuality of any proposed connection short of exact quotation, however, will have to be considered to lie within ranges of probability.

The only potential explicit quotation of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel that has been suggested occurs in John 10:16, where Barrett sees Ezekiel 34:23 and 37:24 being echoed from the LXX.⁵⁰ The problem with accepting this as a quotation is that only two words coincide, though there is considerable similarity of thought in the text. This is hardly an open and shut case. MacKay would deny that any direct quotations of Ezekiel exist in the New Testament⁵¹ and Evans does not include Ezekiel in his list of quotations from the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel.⁵² The evidence for Ezekiel in the background to the Gospel will have to be established on the basis of other intertextual features—vocabulary, themes and motifs.

Intertextuality, the relationship of texts to other texts, is certainly not a new concept to biblical studies or to the study of the Fourth Gospel.⁵³ Seeking the background of certain themes, motifs, images, and vocabulary found in the Gospel in earlier literature—whether Jewish, Hellenistic, or some other source—has long been an established task in New Testament study.⁵⁴ However,

49 As in John 1:23, where Isaiah is quoted and his name is mentioned.

50 C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2nd. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 28.

51 Cameron MacKay, "Ezekiel in the New Testament," *CQR* 162 (1961), 4–16.

52 Craig A. Evans, "On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel," *BZ* 26 (1982), 79–83.

53 It is true, though, that the term "intertextuality" is relatively new, being coined by Julia Kristeva in *Semiotike*, 1969. However, application of the term has been far from uniform according to Timothy K. Beal, "Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production," in *Reading Between Texts*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell, 27. The term has been used to refer to the observation of simple relationships between texts that aid interpretation (as by Robbins), and also more recently to refer to the way in which the authors of some texts appear purposefully to disturb and re-center prior texts (the post-structuralists); Miscal, "Isaiah," 44. This study will follow the model provided by Robbins in *Jesus the Teacher*.

54 Commentaries are full of references to Old Testament texts, extra-canonical Jewish texts, Hellenistic literature, etc., as parallels, sources and influences from which meaning is to be extracted for specific texts under consideration. These references, whether specifically identified as "intertextual" connections or not, are efforts to relate texts to other texts

some of the more modern literary approaches to interpretation, in an effort to let the text speak for itself and to appreciate it for its own artistry, have failed to take seriously the “intertexture” of the narratives under consideration.⁵⁵ To do so does not take away from the objectives of the literary critic,⁵⁶ indeed, the work of narratological criticism stands as a refreshing new approach to interpretation and breathes new life into the discussion surrounding certain well-worn texts, but intertextual connections can imply a range of interpretation that a strictly narratological approach can miss.⁵⁷ This study is intended as a caution against an approach that would totally ignore the intertexture of a text.

3 The Johannine Community and Ezekiel

When speaking of the Johannine Community the terms “circle” and “school” have been used to talk about the group, or church community, or theological mind set that produced the Johannine documents of the New Testament. By “circle” Cullmann refers to a more or less identifiable group of people with a

and are therefore concerned with the notion of intertextuality. Rashkow points out that intertextuality on a linguistic level, the “study of lexical similarities and differences is, in fact, one of the mainstays of biblical criticism” in “Intertextuality,” 57.

55 Robert Kysar, in *John's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), largely ignores the intertexture of the Gospel. He acknowledges the need for both historical investigation of the Gospel on the one hand, and the study of the literary structure on the other (p. 11). Kysar then chooses to do the literary study in his book and ignore the historical questions of which discovering intertextual connections is a small part. At least he appreciates the fact that the task of interpretation remains incomplete until the historical examination has taken place. On the other hand, a more recent monograph by Moloney does make reference on occasion to the background in the Old Testament with which the readers of the Fourth Gospel should have been familiar. See Francis J. Moloney, *Belief in the Word: Readings in the Fourth Gospel, John 1–4* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 97. By doing this, Moloney is showing awareness of the intertexture of John's Gospel.

56 The newer literary approaches seek to uncover the narrative design of the Gospel and let the “story” speak for itself. An excellent example is R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), where he deals with the narrator and point of view, narrative time, plot, characterization, implicit commentary and the implied readers of the Gospel. Culpepper presents the issues at stake in the narrative world of John's Gospel without once referring to any intertextual link with Ezekiel.

57 For instance, recalling the promise of God in Ezekiel 36:25–27, “I will sprinkle clean water on you, and you shall be clean ... a new heart will I give you ... And I will put my spirit within you,” could make intelligible the expectation of Jesus for Nicodemus to understand a birth of water and spirit in John 3:1–10. Culpepper overlooks this possible connection in his discussion of Nicodemus's misunderstanding; *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, 155.

common theological viewpoint, having grown up around a central figure (the Beloved Disciple; a teacher, preacher, pastor and eye-witness to events in the life of Jesus), and located within a certain geographical area.⁵⁸ By “school” Culpepper envisions a more formal group with teacher/s and disciples similar to the ancient Greco-Roman schools.⁵⁹

Which New Testament documents bear witness to the theological perspective of the Johannine Community? The answer given from Church tradition has been the Fourth Gospel, the Epistles of John, and the Apocalypse. And this is generally in mind when many scholars refer to the Johannine corpus. This is not to presuppose common authorship as ascribed by tradition. In fact, few scholars in Johannine research would argue for common authorship of the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, but most would agree that they belonged to the same theological community.⁶⁰ Despite the differences found in the writings ascribed to John, the similarities in vocabulary, themes and provenance, coupled with the witness of tradition, point to a common community lying behind the documents.⁶¹

58 Oscar Cullmann, *The Johannine Circle*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975).

59 R. Alan Culpepper, *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools* (SBLDS 26; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975). Cullmann accepts the possibility of it being a “school” even though he prefers the term circle, *Johannine Circle*, 7.

60 According to Ralph Martin, *New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 366; R. E. Brown (*The Epistles of John* [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982], 21) even argues that 1 John and the Fourth Gospel are more similar to one another than Luke and Acts. This point was made by John Christopher Thomas and Frank D. Macchia, *Revelation* (Two Horizons New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 19. This is certainly true of the Gospel and the Epistles, although questions have been raised regarding the Apocalypse. Elisabeth S. Fiorenza, “The Quest for the Johannine School: The Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 23 (1977), 402–427; argues that the Gospel and the Apocalypse are too divergent, both in eschatology and theology, to have come from the same hand. She further denies that they could have come from the same theological circle. Her conclusion is that the Apocalypse and the Gospel came from two different schools, not rivals, but distinct from one another, even though there might have been some dialogue and dialectical interaction between the two, and that the Apocalypse has more in common with the Pauline community. Brown believes that Fiorenza’s hypothesis exaggerates the differences and, although he does not include the Apocalypse in his discussion of the Johannine community, he believes that it can provide additional insight into that community; *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 6.

61 See Y. Simoons, *Apocalypse de Jean: Apocalypse de Jésus Christ* (Paris: Éditions Facultés Jésuites de Paris, 2008), xii; Martin Hengel, *Die johanneische Frage: Ein Lösungsversuch* (WUNT 67; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 326ff.; Hengel’s earlier and more condensed

What does this discussion have to do with Ezekiel in the background to the Fourth Gospel? Namely, if it is likely that the Apocalypse originated from within the same community and intellectual climate as John's Gospel, and that Ezekiel had a marked influence on the Apocalypse, then the influence of Ezekiel might be also anticipated in the Gospel. Obviously the two documents have extremely different characteristics and one would not expect the influence to operate at the same level in each, particularly if the pieces were to be traced to different authors within the group. But it would be reasonable to anticipate, though not assume, a shared familiarity with Ezekiel.

Readers acquainted with the literature on the Book of Revelation are aware of the well-documented connection of Ezekiel with the Apocalypse. Ezekiel, "the Father of Old Testament Apocalyptic,"⁶² played a major role in providing the vocabulary, themes, figures, descriptions, and sometimes even parallels the order of events in the Apocalypse.⁶³ Significant literature has been devoted to the examination of the connections between the two books. At least for the John of the Apocalypse, Ezekiel's prophecies played a major role in shaping his presentation of "the vision on Patmos."

Thus, accepting the likelihood that the Apocalypse probably originated from within the Johannine community,⁶⁴ and acknowledging that Ezekiel has been shown to be a major influence in the Apocalypse, it is reasonable to look for evidence of Ezekiel in the background to the Gospel. However, this study will not utilize evidence of influence in the Apocalypse to prove a connection in the Gospel. At some points intertextuality between Ezekiel and the Apocalypse may be cited in the footnotes to strengthen the connection of Johannine themes with Ezekiel, but the study will be able to stand on its own apart from an appeal to the Apocalypse. The burden of proof remains

The Johannine Question, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1989), 127, and I. Howard Marshall, *The Epistles of John* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1978), 41.

62 A title sometimes ascribed to Ezekiel according to Bruce Vawter and Leslie J. Hoppe, *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (International Theological Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 16. Ezekiel is also referred to in this way by William H. Brownlee, in *Ezekiel 1-19*, Word Biblical Commentary, 28 (Waco: Word, 1986), xxxv.

63 A comparison of Ezekiel and the Apocalypse was conducted by the primary author (Bill Fowler) for a graduate seminar on the Apocalypse at the Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley, 1992. With texts of Ezekiel and the Apocalypse side by side, and textual connections in bold print, the relationship was apparent. The parallels were unmistakable and extensive.

64 As does James L. Price, "Light from Qumran upon Some Aspects of Johannine Theology," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd rev. ed., ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1990), 11.

on the text of the Gospel to reveal its intertextual connection with the Book of Ezekiel. What will emerge is the realization of the importance of Ezekiel to the community as a whole, and not only to an element within that community represented by the Apocalypse.

4 Prior Research into the Inter-relatedness of Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel

A brief survey of the literature that investigates the inter-relatedness of Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel is appropriate here to highlight the importance of this study. The research has been extremely limited. Most of what is available falls under one of the following categories.

(1) Notes in commentaries. In the commentaries on either the Gospel of John or the Book of Ezekiel one can find an occasional observation of connect-edness (intertextuality) in a comment or paragraph, but little more.⁶⁵ Usually such references are relegated to brief notes or mere citations of the Scripture reference. Commentaries with indexes to Scripture references are helpful in locating discussions of possible Ezekielian influence.⁶⁶

(2) Journal articles on specific texts or themes in the Fourth Gospel. Often a writer providing exposition of a specific text or theme in the Gospel will observe and present an intertextual connection with Ezekiel.⁶⁷ On occasion, a reference to Ezekiel may even appear in the title of the article.⁶⁸ These are helpful, but the discussion of such points of contact with Ezekiel is usually quite

65 Such as Thomas L. Brodie's inclusion of Ezekiel 17 (without comment) in a list of Old Testament verses that provide background for the vine image in John 15, in *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 475; or G. A. Cooke's mention of Ezekiel 37:25 as probably being alluded to in John 12:34 (also without further comment), in *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), 403.

66 Examples of commentaries which provide scripture reference indexes are: Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*; Brown, *John*, Anchor Bible; Schnackenburg, *John*; Cooke, *Ezekiel*; and J. Ramsey Michaels, *John* (NIBC 4; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrikson Publishing, 1989). Some which do not are Brodie, *Gospel According to John*; Bultmann, *John*; and Walther Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, Old Testament Library, trans. Cosslett Quin (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970).

67 Examples include: G. R. Beasley-Murray, "John 3:3,5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom," *ExpTim* 97 (1986), 167–170; and Juan B. Cortes, "Yet Another Look at John 7:37–39," *CBQ* 29 (1967), 75–86.

68 Examples include Duncan M. Derrett, "Impurity and Idolatry: John 13, 11; Ezekiel 36, 25," *Biblical Origins* 34 (1992), 87–92; and Bruce H. Grigsby, "Gematria and John 21:11—Another Look at Ezekiel 47:10," *ExpTim* 95 (1984), 177–178.

limited and the importance of Ezekiel's influence on the rest of the Gospel can easily be missed.

(3) Investigations of Old Testament themes appearing in the New Testament. In studies such as F. F. Bruce's *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*,⁶⁹ connections between the Testaments are observed and explored more thoroughly but the scope is generally quite broad and specific intertextual links between Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel get lost in a bigger picture.

(4) Studies on the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel. While there has been an interest in recent decades in the Fourth Gospel's use of the OT, few make connections with Ezekiel.⁷⁰ One exception is Carlos Raul Sosa Siliezar's *Creation Imagery in the Gospel of John*, where there are 25 references to Ezekiel. However, most of these references are simply made in passing, and the discussion of the language of Ezekiel appears to be based primarily on Manning's work.⁷¹ These do little to advance the study at hand, but they do accentuate the need for Ezekiel's importance to be brought to light.

(5) Studies on Ezekiel's influence in the New Testament. Occasionally the introduction to a commentary on Ezekiel may include some statement of his importance in the New Testament.⁷² A few journal articles have appeared which focus on his influence in the New Testament as a whole.⁷³ The articles cited below have been very helpful in detecting the influence in the Fourth Gospel. Both bring out the fact that the Apocalypse reflects the greatest debt to Ezekiel in the New Testament; both also point to the Fourth Gospel as another area where the influence can be perceived.

69 F. F. Bruce, *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968). Other examples include: Henry M. Shires, *Finding the Old Testament in the New* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974); and Smith, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," 3–65.

70 Wm. R. Bynum, *The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37* (NovTSup, 144; Leiden: Brill, 2012); Evans, "Quotation Formulas," 79–83; Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 12 (1990), 19–41; Richard Morgan, "Fulfillment," 155–165; and Günter Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*, ed. M. Black (SNTSMS 22; London: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

71 Carlos Raul Sosa Siliezar, *Creation Imagery in the Gospel of John* (LNTS 546; London: T&T Clark, 2015).

72 See D. M. G. Stalker, *Ezekiel* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1968); and William H. Brownlee, *Ezekiel 1–19* (WBC 28; Waco: Word, 1986), xli–xlii.

73 Examples include: Bullock, "Ezekiel, Bridge Between the Testaments," 23–31; and Cameron Mackay, "Ezekiel in the New Testament," 4–16.

(6) Studies on Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel. In an article in 1964, Bruce Vawter stated his conviction that has become the main concern of our study:

This paper is limited to a consideration of some of the influences of the book of the prophet Ezekiel on the fourth Gospel and its theology.... By influence is meant ... the exploitation of certain themes or concepts which John is more likely to have taken from Ezekiel than any other source.... It is not ... that such a study would reveal Ezekiel to have been the chief or even a chief influence on John, but the author is convinced that the influence is greater than one might gather from the commentators on John.⁷⁴

The chief weakness of his article is that it is limited to a discussion of John's usage of "Son of Man" and "Paraclete."

As noted above, two important monographs have sought to address the relationship of Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel. First, Gary T. Manning, in his 2004 work, *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*, identifies two major allusions: the good shepherd (Ezek 34 and 37 and John 10), and the true vine (Ezek 15 and 17 and John 15). He also offers several potential minor allusions.⁷⁵ However, Manning does not deal with the linguistic data as comprehensively as this study does. The second, more recent, important monograph in this regard is Brian Neil Peterson, *John's Use of Ezekiel: Understanding the Unique Perspective of the Fourth Gospel* (2015). Peterson argues that John was most directly influenced by Ezekiel in structure, so that John 1 follows Ezek 1–3, John 2 (cleansing of the Temple) follows Ezek 8–11, John 20 (Jesus giving the Spirit) follows Ezek 37, and John's Temple references (John 2:19; 20:23; 21:1–11) invoke Ezekiel's restored temple in chapters 40–48. Peterson's work more closely resembles the approach of this study. In fact, Peterson acknowledges his indebtedness to much of the data which was presented in the original dissertation that inspired this monograph.⁷⁶

74 Bruce Vawter, "Ezekiel and John," *CBQ* 26 (1964), 450–458. Quotation from 450.

75 Namely, (1) John 1:51 cf. Ezek 11; (2) John 3:5; 4:13–14 cf. Ezek 36:25–27; (3) John 5:25–28 cf. Ezekiel 37:4, 9, 12; (4) John 7:37–39 cf. Ezek 47:1–12; (5) John 20:22 cf. Ezek 37:9; and (6) John 21:1–11 cf. Ezek 47:9–10.

76 William Glenn Fowler, "The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel: Intertextuality and Interpretation" (Ph.D. diss., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995). See Peterson, 1, n. 1.

(7) Miscellaneous. Sporadic allusions to passages in Ezekiel that correlate with the Fourth Gospel are given in various other works as well.⁷⁷ Gleaning these tidbits of information is a tedious task. The significance of Ezekiel is lost by the failure to focus on his unique contributions to the Fourth Gospel.

What remains to be done is an investigation that will pull together the various points of contact between the two books and illumine the importance of the Book of Ezekiel for the Gospel of John. To provide such a comprehensive presentation is an aim of this work.

5 Critical Issues⁷⁸

5.1 *Authorship*

We do not debate the authorship of the Fourth Gospel in this study. Tradition attributes the Gospel to John the Son of Zebedee, the Beloved Disciple, but questions have lingered from the second century.⁷⁹ Scholarship has failed to reach any consensus as to the identity of the author of the Fourth Gospel. Introductions to the New Testament reveal that many possibilities have been set forth: John the Apostle, John the Elder, some other John of the first (or second) century, Lazarus,⁸⁰ John Mark,⁸¹ or some anonymous person. For purposes of this study the author of the Fourth Gospel will be referred to as “John,” or the “Evangelist.” This does not mean that the vexing problem of authorship has been solved for us.⁸² The utilization of the name provided by tradi-

77 An example is Heinz Eduard Tödt, who refers to both John 1:51 and Ezekiel 1:1 in his discussion of the opened heavens motif in *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, New Testament Library, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965), 304.

78 For a survey of Johannine studies (authorship, date, audience, Johannine community, etc.) covering most articles, monographs, essays, and commentaries from the late nineteenth century to 2012, see Porter and Gabriel, *The Johannine Writings and Apocalyptic*, esp. 11–14. Also see the many works listed in Stanley E. Porter and Hughson T. Ong, *The Origins of John's Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 1–2.

79 Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, revised English edition, trans. Howard C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), 196–197.

80 Floyd V. Filson, “Who Was the Beloved Disciple?” *JBL* 68 (1949), 83–88. He reminds us that Lazarus was the only man in the Gospel who is mentioned as one whom Jesus loved (John 11:3–5), and a likely candidate for the rumor that he would not die.

81 J. N. Sanders, “Who Was the Disciple Whom Jesus Loved?” in *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Limited, 1957), 72–82. John (Mark) supposedly settled in Ephesus after the death of Peter and Paul, wrote the Epistles, published the Gospel, and later wrote the Apocalypse (though it may have been pseudepigraphal).

82 Brown has a hypothesis of authorship/composition in five stages; *John*, Anchor Bible, xxxiv–xxxix, xcvi–cii. Allowing for slight modifications as to the involvement of the

tion will simply be for convenience's sake without insisting that the author was John the Apostle, John the Elder, or some other John of whom we have no knowledge.⁸³ Knowing the identity of the author would be helpful, but is not necessary. What matters is whether or not the Book of Ezekiel was an important influence on the presentation of Jesus in John's Gospel.

5.2 *Relationship to the Apocalypse*

The customary question about the relationship of the author of the Fourth Gospel to the Apocalypse will also be irrelevant. It will be assumed that both the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse have originated from within the same community. However, the familiarity of the Johannine community with themes and motifs in Ezekiel, strongly suggested by studies in the Apocalypse, will not be accepted as evidence for Ezekiel's influence on John's presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. The Gospel will be evaluated on its own ground for such an influence from Ezekiel.

5.3 *Unity and Order of Composition*

A survey of the major commentaries on the Gospel reveals that many scholars sense that the flow of the narratives is at several points rough and abrupt.⁸⁴ Dislocation theories abound and often commentators feel compelled to rearrange the material.⁸⁵ However, both Barrett⁸⁶ and Dodd⁸⁷ are convinced that the present order of the Gospel is satisfactory and must be taken seriously. For this study, the unity of the Gospel as it exists will be assumed and no effort will be made to access the opinions on restoring an "original" order. The Book of Ezekiel will likewise be accepted as the text presently stands. What

apostle at various levels of composition, it is easy to imagine a key source of tradition, John the son of Zebedee, working in conjunction with a primary disciple to compose the Gospel, and completion by a final redactor. However, we suggest readers consult the many arguments and counterarguments vis-à-vis authorship of the Fourth Gospel by several scholars in Porter and Ong, *The Origins of John's Gospel*.

83 In like manner, the Fourth Gospel will hereafter be referred to as "the Gospel of John" or "John's Gospel" without such a reference implying anything about authorship other than that this is the traditional name for the Gospel.

84 Kysar, *John's Story*, 12.

85 For a brief survey of dislocation theories and an evaluation see Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (Downer's Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1970), 312–316. Guthrie argues that there is no textual support for any of these theories and that they are unnecessary.

86 Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, 26.

87 Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 240.

is important here is how Ezekiel may have shaped the conceptual position of the Gospel rather than its formal structure.

5.4 *Historicity*

It remains outside the limits of this study to deal with the thorny question of the historical nature of events and dialogue in the Gospel. References to Jesus will point to what is found in the narrative of the Gospel and will not be intended as a statement about the historical Jesus. On the other hand, references made to John's "presentation" of Jesus in the Gospel are not intended to preclude the possibility that Jesus himself was the first to interpret his mission in light of certain prophecies in Ezekiel and that John recognized this and recorded evidence of it in the Gospel. Many, including the present authors, believe that this was indeed the case, though it cannot be proven.⁸⁸ Others will prefer to deal with the issue of influence only at the literary level. This latter course, focusing on the literary level, has been chosen here for the sake of scholarly argument.

6 Methodology

The Fourth Gospel has been compared to an archaeological "tell" where excavation has to be conducted through various strata of composition and editing to arrive at the original foundations of the text under consideration.⁸⁹ This "digging through the layers of the text" is called a diachronic approach. It is to be contrasted with the synchronic approach where the text is interpreted as it stands and in light of itself. The diachronic approach has been the basic *modus operandi* of the historical-critical method, whereas the synchronic approach is the way of the newer literary-critical method.⁹⁰ Both have strengths and weaknesses and both are needed to grasp the message of the Fourth Gospel.

The approach taken in this study has been primarily diachronic. It investigates the "tell" of the Fourth Gospel, not so much trying to identify the various layers of composition, but to identify the source of certain elements within those layers, namely, elements that drew their inspiration from the Book of

88 W. A. Curtis, in *Jesus the Teacher: A Study of His Method and Message Based Mainly on the Earlier Gospels* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), 138, has pointed out similarities between the message of Ezekiel and the life of Jesus, and has called for a study of the relation between the Book of Ezekiel and the mind of Jesus.

89 J. Louis Martyn, *The Gospel of John in Christian History* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), 90–91. The idea of "strata" in a text's history is common, and compatible with this analogy.

90 Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, 2–7.

Ezekiel. It has been similar to the identification of bits of pottery within a tell. Certain characteristics of pottery—design, color, decoration, clay composition, etc.—link the pieces with certain time periods, geographical locations, and cultural influences. Pottery shards reveal a great deal about the tell and are primary pieces of evidence from which the archaeologist can interpret what he finds there. Intertextual links are like pieces of pottery which, when identified and classified, can help interpret the Gospel.

The focus of the study has been aimed at “finding pottery shards” that reveal an Ezekielian origin.⁹¹ Determining these intertextual connections necessitated a close reading of both the Book of Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel to “listen” for common vocabulary, themes, and motifs.⁹² The research required separate listings of key words, recurring themes, and characteristic phraseology of each text.⁹³ These were then compared to look for indications of intertextuality.⁹⁴ The results of this comparative study are presented in the discussion below. Furthermore, the available literature on both John and Ezekiel—commentaries, journal articles, and related monographs—has been surveyed to discover areas where prior scholarship has noted evidences of intertextuality. These have been evaluated and included below where pertinent to the discussion.

Once the locations of possible intertextuality were identified, the texts were analyzed to evaluate the degree of probability that the Ezekiel text influenced the conceptual pattern of the Gospel text.⁹⁵ The following questions

-
- 91 Following the archaeological analogy, if a nearby tell (theologically speaking), the Apocalypse, reveals a large deposit of Ezekielian pottery, then it seems reasonable to search for a similar deposit of pottery in the tell of the Fourth Gospel.
 - 92 Shires, *Finding the Old Testament in the New*, has identified four ways that the Old Testament finds expression in the New Testament: (1) citation with formula; (2) citation without formula; (3) key words and phrases; and (4) themes and images. Of these, only (3) and (4) can be found in John's use of Ezekiel.
 - 93 Brown's list of Johannine vocabulary was consulted in *John*, Anchor Bible, 497–518. Other authors' focus on distinct vocabulary in the Gospel was also observed, such as Leon Morris' additional notes on various Johannine terms in *The Gospel According to John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971). The words finally chosen for comparison are provided in Chapter 2.
 - 94 The chief direction of the study has been to trace Johannine vocabulary and motifs back to Ezekiel. The reverse investigation, starting in Ezekiel and seeing if and how John utilized Ezekiel's key themes in the Gospel, has been conducted on only a limited basis.
 - 95 Richard Hays has proposed seven criteria for identifying and interpreting intertextual echoes: 1) availability (was the text available to the author and the readers), 2) volume (repetition of words and syntactical patterns), 3) recurrence (is a text alluded to elsewhere), 4) thematic coherence (does it fit the development of the text), 5) historical plausibility (could the author have intended the reader to understand it), 6) history of

were asked: Is there a clear connection? Is Ezekiel the only voice to be “heard” in the background, or are there other texts which could have as easily influenced the Evangelist? Are there other factors that could account for the way John expressed himself in the Gospel apart from influence by Ezekiel? Has the tradition from Ezekiel been adopted, or has it been adapted, by John? The arguments and opinions of other scholars on these points have been observed and appraised.

Finally, the evidences of intertextuality have been examined to determine their importance to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Certain considerations have been pondered. Are some obscure passages in the Gospel made clear by a background in Ezekiel? Have any common interpretations been proven faulty in light of the intertexture of the Gospel? Does the obvious presence of strong ties with Ezekiel at certain points suggest anything about seeking intertextual connections with Ezekiel elsewhere? Does an appreciation of Ezekiel's influence on the thought of the Fourth Gospel make a significant difference in the way it is interpreted? Is a reliable interpretation, one consistent with John's authorial intent, possible without due consideration of Ezekiel in the intertexture of the Gospel? An effort has been made to answer these questions.

7 Presentation

The findings of this research could be presented in a number of ways. One would be to discuss the passages in the Fourth Gospel where an intertextual connection with Ezekiel can be demonstrated *in the order of their appearance* in the Gospel. A sequential approach has the advantage of being orderly but could fail to express the relative importance of Ezekiel's influence on various passages. This is particularly true where themes are developed in a number

interpretation (have other readers heard the same echoes), and 7) satisfaction (does it make sense in the context); in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–32. Of these Richard L. Brawley considers only “volume” to be a critical criterion while the others are thought to be valuable for confirmation on a secondary level; “An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28–29,” *JBL* 112 (1993), 436. Hays himself does not use the criteria explicitly in reading texts, but lets them implicitly undergird his exegetical judgments; *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 29. This study has focused on volume and has kept the other factors in mind when evaluating texts. Regarding Hays' work, we also consider his important and more recent contribution to the study of the relationship between Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel (from which we quote at the beginning of this chapter) in Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*.

of passages throughout the Gospel and a strictly sequential approach would obscure the preponderance of that particular motif.

A second method of presentation would be to discuss *according to the relative degree of certainty* the themes, motifs, phrases, and vocabulary for which Ezekiel can be demonstrated to supply the background in John's Gospel. This would be a highly subjective ordering of the material and the reader might not be convinced that the authors' judgments are warranted. The approach also has the disadvantage of each case becoming less convincing as the study progresses from themes which are likely to be influenced by Ezekiel to those for which a connection is conjectural at best. This would probably diminish the persuasive force of those evidences cited at the beginning.

A third choice would be to discuss the themes that owe a debt to Ezekiel *in the order in which they appear in the Gospel*. This has the advantage of a broader perspective, seeing how themes from Ezekiel are taken up and utilized by John throughout his Gospel. Of course, not all the themes, motifs, and vocabulary can be traced to Ezekiel with the same degree of certainty. Some are more obvious than others and would hardly be disputed by scholars while others are open to debate. In addition, there are some minor points of wording or phraseology, not necessarily related to larger themes in the Gospel, which may have been inspired by Ezekiel. These would be missed in a wholly thematic approach.

The model chosen here will be a combination of the second and third choices above. Prominent motifs and themes, together with related sub-themes, phraseology and vocabulary, which can likely be connected with Ezekiel will be presented as they occur in the Gospel. At times, this prominence may not be immediately obvious, but subsequent discussion will seek to validate the selections given. The outline of the discussion will flow from primary points of contact to secondary points of contact.

This presentation of points of contact between the Gospel and the prophecy of Ezekiel will be preceded by a general comparison of the theological vocabularies of John and Ezekiel. Not only will frequency of word usage be observed, but also any peculiarities of meaning that the two have in common. A comparison of these vocabulary connections to usage by other Old Testament writings will also be provided to show whether or not Ezekiel is the best candidate for influencing John's usage of certain vocabulary. Investigation of other Old Testament writers will of necessity be limited. It will be impossible to pursue all of John's vocabulary in each of the Old Testament books with the attention to detail that will be given to Ezekiel. However, where a brief survey of the other writers warrants further study, because of frequency of usage or the

appearance of an echo in John, a conscientious appraisal of the significance of other books will be given.

The vocabulary study will be similar to conducting a preliminary dig on an archaeological site to determine the most promising areas for major excavation. From the lexical study, the focus will shift to setting forth those motifs and themes where influence from Ezekiel has been accorded a reasonable degree of certainty. The study will close with a review of other themes, figures, and miscellaneous phrases that may have a connection with Ezekiel. The degree of certainty that John owes a debt to Ezekiel for material in this section varies greatly. Some are merely observations of possible connections that have appeared in the literature on John and/or Ezekiel. Taken in isolation, these perhaps would appear doubtful to have come from Ezekiel. However, in light of the discussion that precedes them, it becomes necessary to give them a second look.

Finally, conclusions will be set forth as to the evidence for an intertextual relationship between John and Ezekiel as a whole, the influence of Ezekiel in shaping the contours of John's witness to Jesus, and the value of recognizing his influence when interpreting the Gospel. Areas where further study is warranted will be given.

The Theological Vocabularies of John and Ezekiel

“Lexical studies are a natural way into intertextual study,” according to Robbins.¹ As biblical scholars have searched for the background to the Fourth Gospel a large amount of attention has been given to the theological vocabulary which John employs.² Points where the Fourth Gospel has shared a common vocabulary with prior literature have often been perceived as indications of an intertextual connection.³ It is difficult to imagine significant influence of one writer upon the thought of another if the resultant expression of that

- 1 Vernon K. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), xxx.
- 2 C. H. Dodd conducted comparative vocabulary studies to research the background of the “leading ideas” of John’s Gospel in *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 133–285. Similar studies have been productive to confirm or deny backgrounds proposed by various scholars. G. D. Kilpatrick has succeeded in demonstrating that the *Hermetica* and John are not closely related (contra Reitzenstein and Bultmann) while John and the Septuagint are; “The Religious Background of the Fourth Gospel,” in *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. F. L. Cross (London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Ltd., 1957) 36–44. C. K. Barrett, after comparing the vocabularies of John and the Gospel of Truth, has concluded that the contacts between the two are only superficial in “The Relation of Gnosticism to the New Testament: The Theological Vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth,” in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*, eds. William Klassen and Graydon Snyder (London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), 210–223.
- 3 Or even with later literature, as was the case for Rudolph Bultmann, who believed that 2nd and 3rd century Gnostic materials in the Mandaean literature reflected a world of thought from which John had borrowed much of his language and many of his themes, *The Gospel of John*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, et al. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 27. Robbins has also defended the use of later material to establish background for texts. He postulates that Mark’s description of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus was influenced by a Persian story, recorded by Dio Chrysostom, even though Chrysostom wrote after the publication of Mark, 188–191. According to Robbins, Chrysostom records a bit of social tradition that was available to Mark and which was used by Mark to set the structure for scenes in the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, xxvi. Robbins has been criticized by Paul Maier for this application of later texts in interpretation in Maier’s review of *Jesus the Teacher*, in *The Christian Century*, 101 (August 1984), 753. Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John’s Prologue* (JSNTS 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 20–28, observes that “virtually every commentary and scholarly study makes use of documents which were written after the New Testament period,” and goes on to propose four criteria by which parallels with postdated materials can be evaluated. This study will limit itself to literature available prior to John’s Gospel.

thought does not utilize anything similar in terms of vocabulary. If Ezekiel was an important source for Johannine thought, then a comparative study of the theological vocabularies of the two books should reveal significant connections. If the vocabularies have only slight connections, and if words are used in radically different senses, then the case for an intertextual relationship is severely compromised.

A comprehensive study of the entire vocabularies of John and Ezekiel lies beyond the scope of this inquiry, though such a study could be profitable.⁴ A common approach in vocabulary study has been to select a key word (or words) from the primary text under investigation and then compare the word (or words) with another text (or texts) and evaluate the relative use of the words by the authors.⁵ That approach will be used here as well. What is critical to proving the thesis of this study is to show that key words in John's vocabulary can be discovered in the Book of Ezekiel and that they have close affinities in meaning. Words, like manuscripts in textual criticism, are to be weighed, not counted. It is not enough to have a large number of the same words used by both writers; the words must also be used with a similar significance in order to establish an intertextual link.

An immediate question comes to mind: "How can one compare the Greek of John's Gospel to the Hebrew of the Book of Ezekiel?" For this study, the Septuagint will be the primary reference point for comparison.⁶ This is not to say that the issue of John's use of the Septuagint has been settled.⁷ However,

4 Kilpatrick took all of John's vocabulary beginning with the letters alpha through delta, eliminated all the proper names, prepositions and particles, to arrive at a list of 197 words. Of these the *Hermetica* failed to employ 115 (almost sixty percent), while in the Septuagint only eight words failed to appear (about four percent). On this evidence, he was able to establish a significantly greater affinity between John and the Septuagint over against the *Hermetica*; "Religious Background," 40–41.

5 Barrett does this with the Gospel of Truth in "The Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth." A similar approach is taken by James H. Charlesworth with the Dead Sea Scrolls in "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13–4:26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," *NTS* 15 (1969), 389–418. Some studies are more limited, such as J. C. Coetzee, "Life (Eternal Life) in John's Writings and the Qumran Scrolls," *Neot* 6 (1972), 50–66.

6 So Andreas J. Köstenberger, "John," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker/Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), 415–512, esp. 417: "John's default version seems to have been the LXX." The Masoretic Text of Ezekiel has been consulted but the results of that consultation only enter into the discussion where it appears significant to the study at hand (e.g., in cases where the Septuagint uses alternate Greek words for the same Hebrew word, and such variation is noteworthy).

7 B. F. Westcott contended that John's quotations from the Old Testament agree with the Hebrew instead of the LXX, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: John Murray, 1902), xiv.

whether John used the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Old Testament or his own, if Ezekiel helped to shape his presentation of the Gospel, then the vocabularies should be similar enough to demonstrate a connection even through the process of translation.⁸ For the sake of simplicity, the Septuagint will be used for Ezekiel so that Greek words (and word groups) can be compared with Greek words.

One other issue needs to be addressed—the beginning point for this study will be the Gospel of John. The main direction of inquiry is from the Evangelist to the Prophet. John's key words will be primary.⁹ The question is: "Does John borrow from, or is he influenced by, Ezekiel?" If Ezekiel has emphases that John does not employ in his presentation of the Gospel, this in no way can be construed as a denial of Ezekiel's influence. Nor should it come as a surprise should some of John's key words not be found in Ezekiel. John's purpose, as well as his sources, guides his choice of words and themes in the Gospel. There is no need to expect all of Ezekiel's themes to be found in the Gospel, nor is it appropriate to demand that all of John's themes be borrowed from Ezekiel. But it is incumbent upon this study to show that there are major points of contact between the vocabularies of the two writers.

The words (or word groups) chosen for comparative investigation are: Father, believe, know, world, send, hear, love, life, bread, light, door, shepherd, resurrection, way, truth, vine, word, witness, glory, judgment, water, spirit, and

But Goodwin believed John made use of the LXX and the places where his allusions to the Old Testament differ from the LXX are due to the fact that he was quoting freely from memory, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" *JBL* 73 (1954), 61–75. C. K. Barrett concurs in *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 28.

- 8 It should be noted that it is common practice to compare vocabularies even when they appear in two different languages. Krister Stendahl notes a passage from *The Manual of Discipline* at Qumran (written in Hebrew) and observes that "we find some words of a quite Pauline ring" (when Paul wrote in Greek); 8–9, in "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957), 1–17. In the same book Raymond E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," 183–207; Karl Georg Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," 94–113; and W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," 157–182; all follow the same pattern of comparing Greek words in the New Testament with the Hebrew of the Scrolls. Likewise, Manning, 12, notes a connection between the Damascus Document (19.33) and Ezek 13:10. This same practice appears to be used in the commentaries when referring to Old Testament passages as background to New Testament texts without any reference to whether the LXX or the Hebrew Bible is in mind.
- 9 For a listing of words and phrases characteristic of Ezekiel, the reader should consult John W. Wevers, ed., *Ezekiel* (NCB; London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1969), 1.

sign.¹⁰ The choice of these words was on the basis of frequency of usage, or the importance that they appear to have in John's theology.¹¹ Others could have been included. Taken as a whole they should provide an adequate and representative group of words with which to establish contact with Ezekiel, if that contact exists.

Each word below has been examined to determine the scope of both its use and its meaning in the books of John and Ezekiel. Computer printouts were made of each scripture passage in which these words appeared and then the words were studied in their contexts to arrive at a comparative understanding of their significance for John and Ezekiel. The evaluations given here are the results of our research unless otherwise noted.¹²

1 Words Used by John Fifty Times or More

Words with their synonyms (such as ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω) or their cognates (as in ζῶῃ, and ζῶω) which are used by John fifty or more times will be taken to be important to his thought unless their frequency can be accounted for in some other way.¹³ Fifty is an arbitrary figure, but high enough to be significant.

10 These words were chosen after some comparison with Ezekiel had been conducted. However, we have striven to be fair in choosing words that reflect Johannine theology rather than those that suggested a connection with Ezekiel.

11 For example, ὁδός is used only four times in the Gospel, but it is found in one of the "I am" sayings of Jesus. Therefore, it is included.

12 When giving the frequency of word usage several sources have been consulted: for the New Testament, J. B. Smith, *Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament* (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1955); for the LXX, George Morrish, *A Concordance of the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1983), originally London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Ltd., 1887; and the Hebrew Bible, George V. Wigram, *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980), originally London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Ltd., 1843. These numbers were then cross-checked by means of three computer programs: *The Online Bible*, ver. 6.12, AV, RSV, and Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, 26th ed., *QuickVerse* 2.0 and *BibleWorks* 7.0. Finally, the numbers were verified against any number counts in the commentaries such as those provided in an appendix on Johannine vocabulary in Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (Anchor Bible, 29; Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966), 497–518. The numbers here remain approximate and depend upon which Greek text is being cited. Variant readings abound.

13 The fact that forms of λέγω are used over 200 times by John (267) is not extraordinary considering that all the gospel writers use them over 200 times as the customary way of relating narrative conversation. In a similar way ποιέω (108 times in John) is common to all New Testament writers and it does not have a distinct Johannine flavor. Κύριος (53 times in John) appears to be more a title of respect in the Gospel than a key theological concept as

And still, words need to be weighed, not counted, in order to determine their importance. The following words appear to have been an integral part of Johannine thought.

1.1 *Father*

In John's Gospel, Jesus makes reference to the *πατήρ* (Father) some 122 times for God and another 16 times for someone other than God. Matthew and Luke record some of this emphasis on Jesus' relationship to the Father, but much less frequently than John (44 and 17 times respectively for Father, and 19 and 38 times for father). It is almost impossible to miss the extraordinary emphasis that John places on Jesus' unique relationship to God, that is, as a son to a father.¹⁴ In the Fourth Gospel, the term Father is the characteristic word for God:¹⁵ Jesus has "glory as of the only Son from the Father" (1:14); although no man has seen God at any time Jesus makes the Father known (1:18); Jesus refers to the Temple as "my Father's house" (2:16); "the Father loves the Son and has given all things into his hand" (3:35); John tells us that the Jews seek to kill Jesus because he called God his Father (5:18); Jesus is sent by the Father (5:23, 36; 6:44, 57; 8:18; 10:36; 12:49; 14:24; and 20:21); both his words and his works are the Father's (14:10); no one comes to the Father except through Jesus (14:7); and Jesus claims to be one with the Father both in an address to the crowds (10:30) and in prayer (17:11).¹⁶ The word Father, therefore, has great significance in the theology of John's Gospel.

Turning to Ezekiel, the word father/s is used 29 times in the LXX, but always in reference to human fathers.¹⁷ At no point does Ezekiel refer to God as Father. The nearest he comes to such a designation is in Ezek 16. There he describes God as seeing Israel while she was squirming as an outcast infant, unwashed and still attached to the umbilical cord. God commands life for the infant and she lives. Later, when she is grown, he chooses her for himself, enters into

in Paul's epistles (the major exception to this statement is Thomas's confession in 20:28, "My Lord and my God").

14 "One might almost say that on Jesus' lips the name 'Father' contains *in nuce* the whole of the evangelist's christology," John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 138.

15 Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 105.

16 These are just a few of the points made about Jesus' relationship to the Father in the Fourth Gospel. An entire dissertation could be given over to the significance of Jesus' references to the Father in this Gospel.

17 Though it is sometimes used metaphorically, such as when God states to Israel that her father was an Amorite (16:3).

covenant with her, and makes her his own. But the relationship is that of husband, not father.

John's emphasis upon God as Father is missing from Ezekiel. This is noteworthy because, while it is not a dominant picture of God in the Old Testament, the image of God as Father is fairly widespread, being found in the Pentateuch, the Deuteronomic History, the Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and Malachi), Psalms and Wisdom Literature.¹⁸ And yet, even there, it is different from what is found in John. No one in the Old Testament speaks of God as Father in the way that Jesus does in the Fourth Gospel.¹⁹ At this point John appears to have drawn from some source other than Ezekiel.

1.2 *Believe*

Believing is an important component of John's Gospel.²⁰ Indeed, it is given as the very purpose of the Gospel in 20:31; "these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." While the noun πίστις, faith, is missing,²¹ and the adjective πιστός, faithful, is used only once, the verb πιστεύω is used 98 times.²² It is used in the Gospel to denote personal trust and confidence, to express being convinced of something (intellectual acceptance of a claim), and even the idea of submission.²³ At times the verb is practically interchangeable with γινώσκω.²⁴

Thirty-four times πιστεύω is used without qualification, that is, without an object, object clause, or prepositional phrase to clarify its meaning, but the context of John's Gospel makes it clear in the other 64 uses that believing

18 Merrill C. Tenney, "Topics from the Gospel of John, Part 1: The Person of the Father," *BibSac* 132 (1975), 37–39.

19 Morris, *John*, 309–310.

20 For Tenney, belief is the central theme of the Gospel: "The development of 'belief' in John's work affords one key to its interpretation and marks its progressive evangelistic appeal"; Merrill C. Tenney, *The Gospel of John* (EBC 9; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 12–13.

21 This corresponds with John's use of the verb γινώσκω and never its noun counterpart. The absence of the noun here may suggest that faith in John's Gospel is dynamic (believing) rather than static (faith). Floyd V. Filson considers that "the attitude which the author wants to further is too personal, active, and life-shaping to express by an abstract noun"; "The Gospel of Life: A Study in the Gospel of John," in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*, ed. William Klassen and Graydon Snyder (London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), 112.

22 No other New Testament writer comes close to this frequency of usage. Acts, where believing in Jesus is a key theme, uses the verb only 39 times, and the whole of the Pauline literature has only 54 uses. Mark is next in line with 15. This is a distinctive emphasis of John.

23 Dodd, *Interpretation*, 179–186.

24 Brown, *John*, 513.

relates to Jesus: in him, his name, his words, his works, his claim to have been sent by the Father, and even that he is “ἐγὼ εἰμι” (8:24 and 13:19).²⁵ The results of believing are: becoming children of God (1:12), not perishing but having eternal life (3:16, 36), not coming unto judgment (5:24), never thirsting (6:35), being raised up on the last day (6:40), receiving the spirit (7:39), never dying (11:26), becoming sons of light (12:36), not walking in darkness (12:46), and even doing greater works than Jesus (14:12). On the other hand, not to believe means that one is condemned already (3:18) and that he will die in his sins (8:24). Nothing could be more important than to believe.²⁶

One searches in vain to find any use of πιστεύω or its cognates in the LXX of Ezekiel. This should not be surprising in light of the fact that πιστεύω is only used 51 times in all of the Old Testament and its Hebrew equivalent is also used only 51 times. Ezekiel describes a right relationship with God in terms of walking in God’s statutes, obeying his ordinances, and keeping his covenant (11:20; 17:14; 18:21). These terms are not foreign to John. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus speaks of the necessity of keeping his word/s (8:51, 52; 12:47; 14:23, 24; 15:20), God’s word (8:55), and his commandments (14:15, 21; 15:20). He warns people not to walk in darkness but in the light (8:12; 11:9, 10; 12:35). Only once does the term “obey” appear in the Gospel (3:36) but it is significant that it is used as a synonym for believing: “He who believes in the Son has eternal life; he does not obey the Son shall not see life.” When the people ask what they must do to do the works of God (that is, to obey God), the answer is: “believe in him whom he has sent” (6:28, 29). For John believing is obeying. While the vocabularies of John and Ezekiel are a bit different at this point, the concepts are quite similar.

1.3 *Know*

It would be incomprehensible for one to miss the importance that the Fourth Gospel places on “knowing” God. While the idea is not absent in the rest of the New Testament it receives its greatest attention in John’s Gospel. John uses γινώσκω 56 times.²⁷ Other writers use the term half as many times or less,

25 For a discussion of the use πιστεύω with various prepositions see Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 1, trans. Kevin Smyth (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1990), 559–563.

26 Certain stages of belief can be inadequate, as in the case of those who believe but do not confess Jesus because they fear the Pharisees (John 12:42–43). Jesus instructs those who believe in 8:30–31 that they are to continue in his word if they are truly to be disciples.

27 It is interesting that 1 John uses γινώσκω 25 times in five chapters. Revelation uses it five times, though the preferred word for knowing there is οἶδα. Most interesting, in light of the connections that have been suggested between John and the Gnostics, is the absence of the noun γνῶσις in the Gospel. Knowledge is not the key issue for John, but knowing God is.

except for Paul who uses it 48 times (60 times if one includes ἐπιγινώσκω) in his thirteen epistles. However, based on usage per page of text in the Greek New Testament, Paul uses the term only half as often as John does in his Gospel. John uses οἶδα 85 times in the Gospel, more than a quarter of its use in the entire New Testament.²⁸ While the words can differ in meaning in certain contexts, John appears to use the terms synonymously.²⁹ In addition to the ordinary use of knowing (intellectual awareness), in the Fourth Gospel the word “denotes emphatically the relationship to God and to Jesus as a personal fellowship.”³⁰

Knowing emerges as a major Johannine theme. Much of the Gospel revolves around the fact that people think they know far more than they do. The world does not know Jesus (1:10), the gift of God (4:10), where Jesus comes from (7:28) or where he is going (8:14), the Father (8:19, 55, et al.), nor can it know the Spirit of truth (14:17). A major pericope points to the fact that a man born blind has come to know more than the Jewish leaders because he has come to know Jesus (9:1–30). Even the disciples are hampered by what they do not know (4:32; 13:7; 14:5, 9; 20:14), but they can come to know by being willing to do God’s will (7:17), and indeed they already know more than they think they do because they know Jesus (14:7).

Jesus knows everything—what is in man (2:25), the circumstances of people (5:6), whether or not people love God (5:42), who will believe and who will not (6:64), what people want to ask (16:19), everything including the love in Peter’s heart (21:17). He knows his sheep and they know his voice (10:1–27).³¹ Most important of all, he knows the Father and makes Him known (7:29).

Knowing Jesus, the truth, sets a man free (8:32), it enables him to know the Father (14:7), and it is eternal life (17:3). And while the world at first did not know Jesus (1:10) it will come to know that he has come from the Father through the fellowship of his followers (17:23) and ultimately when he is lifted up (8:28).

Turning to Ezekiel, one finds a similar emphasis on knowing. The LXX translates Ezekiel’s vocabulary with γινώσκω 60 times and ἐπιγινώσκω 32 times.

28 When 1 John and Revelation are included in the count, one out of every three times οἶδα is used in the New Testament occurs in Johannine literature.

29 Nigel Turner has described John as having “pointless variety in style,” *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, vol. 4, *Style* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1976), 76–77. According to Gary Burge, John uses synonyms (for “know,” “send,” “love,” “ask,” “sheep,” etc.) often as a means of breaking up the monotony of language; *Interpreting the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), 154.

30 See “γινώσκω,” *TDNT* 3:711.

31 “Knowing” for John is relational, not intellectual. It is gained from experience (6:69), and involves a commitment to Jesus.

No other OT book deals with knowing with such frequency, and nothing seems to be as important to Ezekiel as the children of Israel, and the nations, coming to know that God is the LORD. In fact, on 62 occasions a variation of the phrase “that you may know that I am the LORD” is found in Ezekiel.

Several points of contact seem to emerge when the language of knowing is compared with John. God knows what is on the mind of His people (Ezek 11:5–6) as Jesus knows what is in the heart of man (John 2:25; 6:64; 16:19). As God is intent to make known His holy name to Israel and the nations (Ezek 39:7) Jesus has been careful to make known His name to the disciples (John 17:26). The nations will come to know the Lord when He comes to vindicate His name (Ezek 37:28; 38:23; et al.) as the world will come to know the truth about Jesus when he is lifted up (John 8:28). And the critical issue for both Ezekiel (62 times) and Jesus (John 17:3) is that men may know God. It appears that what John has emphasized under the motifs of believing and knowing (combined in John 6:69), Ezekiel deals with primarily under the concept of knowing.

1.4 *World*

The world is a huge concept in the Fourth Gospel as κόσμος is used 79 times by John in the Gospel.³² The world was made through Jesus (1:10) but one should not see it as “the totality of creation, but (as) the world of men and human affairs.”³³ Jesus is sent into the world because of the Father’s love for the world on a mission of salvation (3:16–17). But the world is a hostile place. It does not know him (1:10), it chooses darkness rather than his light (3:19), and it hates him (7:7) and those who have believed in him (17:14). Still he does not judge the world but seeks to save it (12:47), and yet his coming is indeed a judgment (9:39) because the world, people, turn away from him (3:19). The world remains a foreign territory (8:23) that Jesus has visited for a while, but will ultimately leave (13:1; 14:19) to go back to his Father (16:28; 17:13). Those who have come to him out of the world will be protected by the Father (17:11), provided with the Spirit (14:17), and eventually be reunited with the Savior (14:3). The prince of the world will be judged and cast out (12:31; 16:11) and the world will come

32 1 John uses κόσμος 23 times. It is used 47 times in Paul’s epistles and only sparingly elsewhere.

33 Barrett, *John*, 161. Sometimes κόσμος can refer simply to the created order (1:10) and sometimes it has the force of “age” (8:23) as αἰών in the Synoptics; Joseph N. Sanders, and B. A. Mastin, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: A. and C. Black, 1968), 76, 223. See also N. H. Cassem, “A Grammatical and Contextual Inventory of the Use of κόσμος in the Johannine Corpus with Some Implications for a Johannine Cosmic Theology,” *NTS* 19 (1972): 81–91.

to know that Jesus really was sent from the Father (17:21–23). The world is the center of the most amazing drama in history for John and men are presented with the choice of remaining in darkness or turning to believe in the Light of the world (8:12).

Turning to the OT, one quickly observes that κόσμος was seldom used in the LXX. Appearing only 30 times in all of the OT, 4 times it is found in Ezekiel. But in Ezekiel it hardly has any of the meaning that is found in the Fourth Gospel. Found only in the plural, it is used to designate “worldly ornaments” worn by the adulterous woman (a picture of unfaithful Israel). At first glance it appears that nothing of John’s emphasis can be found in Ezekiel.

While this is largely true, it is possible to find some affinities under the word ἔθνη, nations.³⁴ For John humankind is divided between those who are of the world and those who are not, those who believe in Jesus and those who do not (and therefore those who belong to God and those who do not). Ezekiel’s world is divided between the children of Israel and the nations. It is before the nations that God’s judgment is taking place (5:8). God will protect His people while they are within the nations (11:16; 34:28) and He will eventually gather them from among the nations (36:24). Where John has the world as the audience of God’s redemptive mission, Ezekiel refers to the nations. It is among the nations that God’s name has been profaned and among the nations that He will vindicate His name (36:23). When this happens, God declares in Ezekiel “then the nations will know” (36:23, 36; 37:28; 38:16, 23; 39:23, 28). This is not a far cry from John’s “that all men may know” (13:35) and “that the world may believe/know” (17:21/23).

Furthermore, there is a resemblance between Ezek 37:21–22 and John 11:50–52 in reference to the “nation” Israel. Compare the following (emphasis ours):

... then say to them, “Thus says the Lord GOD: ‘Behold *I will take the people of Israel* from the nations among which they have gone, *and will gather them from all sides*, and bring them to their own land; *and I will make them one nation* in the land, upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king over them all; and *they shall be no longer two nations*, and no longer divided into two kingdoms”.

EZEK 37:21–22

34 Ezekiel uses the singular to refer to Israel (2:3; 36:13–16; 37:22) and the plural to refer to the nations that surrounded Israel (83 times).

... “you do not understand that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish.” He (Caiaphas) did not say this of his own accord, but being high priest that year he prophesied that *Jesus should die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad.*

JOHN 11:50–52

Both texts portray a divided and scattered Israel being gathered into one nation. A difficulty here is that the term ἔθνος, nation, is only used of the Jewish nation in John’s Gospel, and never of the Gentiles as it is in Ezekiel. John and Ezekiel are close in meaning at this point and yet difficulties remain.

1.5 *Send*

Another of the significant themes of John’s Gospel is that of Jesus being the one who was sent.³⁵ The words ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω are used 28 and 33 times respectively to express this idea. John appears to use the terms interchangeably.³⁶ The group that questions John the Baptist can refer to “those who sent (πέμπω) us,” (1:22) and then it is explained that “they had been sent (ἀποστέλλω) by the Pharisees,” (1:24). Annas sends (ἀποστέλλω) Jesus bound to the house of Caiaphas. Jesus can seek to do the will of “him who sent (πέμπω) me,” (5:30), and then state that his works bear witness that “the Father has sent (ἀποστέλλω) me” (5:36). In his sending of the disciples he says, “As the Father has sent (ἀποστέλλω) me, even so I send (πέμπω) you” (20:21). If there is a differentiation between the two terms in the Fourth Gospel, it is quite subtle.

The “sending” language of the Fourth Gospel underscores the fact that Jesus is on a mission from God.³⁷ All that he does is in conjunction with, and under the authority of, the Father who sent him (14:10). How men respond to the one who was sent is an indication of their relationship, or lack of relationship, to the one who sent him (5:23; 8:42). When the blind man plunges into the “Sent” one, he is able to be healed of his blindness and truly see (9:7). Those who respond to Jesus are then sent as he is sent to become involved in God’s redemptive mission (17:18; 20:21).

35 For Calvin Mercer, this is a major motif that has been neglected and misunderstood by scholars. See his discussion in “Jesus the Apostle: ‘Sending’ and the Theology of John,” *JETS* 35 (1992), 457.

36 Barrett, *John*, 569.

37 Bultmann, *John*, 50.

Ezekiel, too, has the language of sending—usually ἐξαποστέλλω (14 times), sometimes ἀποστέλλω (6 times), and ἐπιφάινω is used once with the force of sending (39:28). Absent is πέμπω. Like the Pharisees sending a delegation to John, messengers and ambassadors are sent in Ezekiel (17:15; 23:16, 40). But while only people are sent in the Gospel, in Ezekiel God sends both judgments (5:17; 14:13, 21; 28:23; 39:6) and blessings (34:26).

A major correlation can be found in that Ezekiel is a *sent* man. He is sent to the house of Israel, a rebellious house, and is instructed to deliver to them God's words (2:3–4; 3:4–11). He is told to listen and speak in a context of judgment (3:10, 17). It sounds very similar to Jesus in the Gospel, "I can do nothing on my own authority; as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just, because I seek not my own will but the will of him who sent me" (5:30). One might note as well that John (the Baptist) is also a *sent* man charged with bearing witness (1:6–8). In the sending language the possibilities of a shared vocabulary appear strong.³⁸

1.6 *Hear*

As with verbs of seeing, hearing can be used at two levels in the New Testament—the physiological and the theological.³⁹ Often in John it has a physiological sense. But one needs to be careful not to dismiss a deeper significance in any text. The Fourth Gospel is filled with irony⁴⁰ and double entendre.⁴¹ John uses ἀκούω 58 times in his Gospel, roughly on a par with the other Gospel writers, though much less than Acts (91 times). Jesus insists that all he says and does grows out of what he hears from the Father (5:50). He declares what he has heard from the Father (8:26; 14:24) and if men do not respond it is because they are not of God (8:47) for all who listen for God's voice to be taught of Him will come to Jesus (6:45). It is important to hear Jesus and to believe his words because in doing so a person receives eternal life

38 The noun form, ἀπόστολος, is of course, an important NT term. In his *First Apology* (19.6), Justin Martyr calls Jesus "Son of God and Apostle" (19.6). As noted by Gareth Lee Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 159.

39 Theological in the sense of becoming aware of and responding to the Word of divine revelation; See "ἀκούω," *TDNT* 1:217–219.

40 R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 165–180; and Paul D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985).

41 G. H. C. MacGregor, *The Gospel of John* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928), 63; and W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 289.

(5:24).⁴² Indeed, even the dead will hear the voice of Jesus and those who hear will live (5:25). Those who fail to keep the words which they have heard will be judged by those words on the last day (12:47–48).

Listening to John's use of ἀκούω in the Gospel, one can readily "hear" echoes of Ezekiel in the background. He, too, was a man who was committed to hearing the words of God and sharing what he heard (3:10–11, 17). He, too, was met by a resistant audience (3:4–7) who at times heard what he had to say but did not keep his words (33:31–32). Those who failed to respond to the words of warning shared by Ezekiel judged themselves (33:1–9). Jesus spoke of a time when the dead would hear his voice and live; Ezekiel was the prophet who was called upon to preach to the dead in the valley of dry bones where, as a result of hearing his preaching, they were raised to life (37:4–10). At this last point the connection between John and Ezekiel appears too certain to be ignored.

1.7 Love

"Love is the theme," so says the gospel hymn, and it is certainly a major theme in the Gospel of John. Over half of the 142 occurrences of ἀγαπάω in the New Testament are found in Johannine literature, and 37 of these are in the Fourth Gospel.⁴³ And over half of the 25 occurrences of φιλέω also appear in John's Gospel (13). The community of the "beloved" disciple, therefore, carries a substantial portion of the load in delivering the New Testament's emphasis on love.

Often the two verbs appear to be used interchangeably.⁴⁴ The Father loves (ἀγαπάω) the son in John 3:35, and loves (φιλέω) the son in John 5:20. He loves (ἀγαπάω) the ones who follow Jesus (14:23), and he loves (φιλέω) them (16:27). Jesus both loves (ἀγαπάω) Lazarus (11:5), and he loves (φιλέω) him as well (11:3). There is the beloved disciple whom Jesus loves (ἀγαπάω) (13:23), and loves (φιλέω) (20:2). Jesus himself is both loved (ἀγαπάω) (14:15), and loved (φιλέω) by the disciples (16:27). The synonymous nature of the verbs seems to remain constant with the possible exception of John 21:15–17 where John may be recording a distinction between the love (ἀγαπάω) about which Jesus first inquires, and the love (φιλέω) that Peter can honestly claim.⁴⁵

42 Genuine faith, according to Craig Koester, happens as a result of hearing. Those whose initial perception of Jesus was based upon seeing failed to come to true faith. When people balked at the words they heard, the possibility of faith degenerated. "Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John," *Biblica* 70 (1989), 347.

43 1 John—28 times, 2 John—two times, 3 John—once, and Revelation—four times.

44 Brown, *John*, 498.

45 For a concise presentation of the various positions taken in regard to John's use of the two verbs in this passage see Leon Morris, *John*, 870–875.

Love in the Gospel is active⁴⁶ and gives expression of itself in various ways. Indeed, the noun, ἀγάπη, is only used seven times compared to the two verbs being used 65 times. Love is the reason that the Father sent the son into the world (3:16). The Father's love for the son has been from before the foundation of the world (17:24) and it is the reason He has given all things into the son's hand (3:35) and why He shows the son everything that He is doing (5:20). Love for Jesus is expressed in keeping his commandments (14:15, 21, 23), rejoicing that he goes to the Father (14:28), and feeding his sheep (21:15–17). Men fail to love Jesus because they love darkness rather than light (3:19), they love the praise of men more than the praise of God (12:43), and because they do not have the love of God in them (5:42). God's great love for the son is the measure of Jesus' love for the disciples (15:9) and then Jesus' own love for the disciples becomes the measure by which his followers are to love one another (15:12). Love for one another is not an option, it is Jesus' commandment for all who claim to love him (13:34) and it will be the hallmark that these belong to him (13:35). The greatest love of all is to lay down one's life for one's friends (15:13).

The vocabulary of love is largely missing in the Book of Ezekiel. Klein observes:

Missing from Ezekiel's descriptions of Yahweh are such standard Old Testament terms as steadfast love, mercy, faithfulness, salvation, and love. The prophet's theological vocabulary leaves the positive actions of Yahweh hard to explain, and it also reveals something of the personality, or at least the theology, of the prophet, who finds it unnecessary to provide further justification for his future hopes.⁴⁷

And yet the theme remains in the background as God continues to work with a rebellious people. This theme of love is dealt with primarily under the motif of the covenant. God loved an outcast, Israel, and entered into covenant with her (16:5–8). With no regard for His goodness, she broke the covenant (16:59), but He promises to re-establish it (16:60–63). There will be forgiveness (16:63), peace (37:21) and mercy (39:25). He is grieved over the lack of love among His people (33:31) and will eventually take their stony heart out and give them a heart of flesh (11:19) so that they can love Him and “walk in my statutes and keep my ordinances and obey them” (11:20; 36:27). When they do, He promises to be with them (11:20; 36:28). This sounds very similar to John 14:21, 23:

⁴⁶ Brown, *John*, 497.

⁴⁷ Ralph W. Klein, *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 145.

He who has my commandments and keeps them, he it is who loves me; and he who loves me will be loved by my Father, and I will love him and manifest myself to him ... If a man loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him.

The language of love in the Fourth Gospel seems to echo the covenant language of Ezekiel at the point of an emphasis on keeping commandments/ordinances.

God loves His own wayward people and will restore them to Himself. There is, however, no hint of God loving a world (the nations) found in Ezekiel. Herein is a significant difference between Ezekiel and the Gospel of John. But then, this is a critical area of difference between John's Gospel and other extra-biblical sources that have been suggested as a background for this Gospel as well.⁴⁸ John gives us an emphasis at this point that is distinctively a New Testament tradition.⁴⁹ Another point of differentiation is the fact that God's motive for action in Ezekiel is more to sanctify His name which has been profaned (Ezek 20:9, 14, 22; 36:22–23; 39:7) than to show his love (John 3:16).

1.8 *Life*

Were it not for a concern about life, the Fourth Gospel would not have been written. The purpose of John's Gospel is stated clearly: "these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name" (20:31). The verb ζᾶω is found 18 times and the noun ζωή 36 times. No other New Testament writer has such a high concentration of usage.

Life is resident in the Father (5:26) and, because of Jesus' relationship to the Father (5:26), it is also resident in him, the Word (1:4; 14:6). Because the Father loves the world, He has given the Son that men might have life (3:15–16; 10:10). Sometimes it is referred to as "eternal life" (3:15–16; 4:14; 5:24; et al.) and sometimes simply as "life" (1:4; 5:26; et al.), but the two are often synonymous (3:36).⁵⁰ To become a recipient of the life which God has in Himself a variety of means are expressed: whoever *believes* in Jesus (or his name) has life (3:15–16, 36; 6:47;

48 At Qumran, love was an important virtue, but the emphasis was different from that found in the New Testament, being restricted to include only the children of light. F. C. Fensham, "Love in the Writings of Qumran and John," *Neot* 6 (1972), 67.

49 Morris, *John*, 229.

50 The primary emphasis of the term is upon the life which is in God and is shared with men, a spiritual reality experienced in fellowship with God. However, on occasions it does refer to physical existence (cf. 4:50–53; 10:15–17; 13:38; and 15:13).

11:25; 20:31), whoever *sees and believes* has life (6:40), whoever *hears* his word (his word is life, 6:63) *and believes* in the one who sent him has life (5:24–25), whoever *eats* of the bread of life (or of the flesh of the Son of man) has life (6:51, 53), whoever *knows* the Father and the Son has life (17:3), and whoever *keeps* his word shall never see death (8:51). Life comes as a gift from Jesus (4:14; 5:21; 6:27, 33; 10:28; 17:2). And this life is a dependent life; in the same way that Jesus is dependent upon the Father for life (5:26; 6:57), men are dependent upon him (5:39–40; 6:51–57; 14:19). To miss life in Jesus is to come under judgment (5:24), to perish (3:16; 10:28), and to have the wrath of God resting upon oneself (3:36).

While the majority of emphasis on life in the Gospel falls on spiritual life, the special life that God has in Himself and offers through Jesus (5:26), occasionally “life” is also used to refer to physical life. The Good Shepherd lays down his life for the sheep (10:11, 15–17). Peter mistakenly boasts that he is prepared to lay down his life for Jesus (13:37–38). Such an act, laying down one’s life for one’s friends, is unsurpassed as an expression of love (15:13).

A corollary to the emphasis on life in the Fourth Gospel is the theme of a new birth (3:1–15). A person must be born again (or from above) to experience life in the kingdom of God. This new birth has two aspects, it is of water and of the spirit. It is in this context that John presents the reason for the Father giving the Son, that men might not perish but have eternal life (3:16).

Ezekiel also has a major emphasis on the theme of life. The LXX uses the verb ζάω 51 times in Ezekiel (surpassed only by Genesis), and the noun ζωή 25 times (surpassed only by Gen, the Psalms and Proverbs). Only Genesis compares with Ezekiel’s abundant interest in the theme of life. In the Old Testament, life is seen primarily in terms of a certain quality of existence lived in fellowship with God, with blessings from God being experienced in day-to-day living.⁵¹ The idea of eternal life is only hinted at in the Old Testament.⁵² This limited understanding of life with God continues in Ezekiel. Life in Ezekiel has a focus on returning to the land and receiving God’s blessing in the land.⁵³ Still, the connection between God and life is very close in Ezekiel. Sixteen times God prefaces what He says through Ezekiel with the phrase, “As I live.”⁵⁴ He is the living one to Ezekiel, and He is the living Father to Jesus (5:57).

51 Walter Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, vol. 2, Old Testament Library, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), 498–499.

52 H. H. Rowley, *The Faith of Israel* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956), 153.

53 Leslie C. Allen, *Ezek 20–48* (WBC 29; Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1990), xxiv.

54 This is not unique to Ezekiel, but it is only used 7 other times in the Old Testament (Num 14:21, 28; Deut 32:40; Isa 49:18; Jer 22:24; 46:18; and Zeph 2:9).

The primary means of securing life in Ezekiel is by turning from wickedness (3:19; 13:22; 18:21–32; 33:9–19), and by keeping, observing, and walking in God's statutes, ordinances and commandments (18:8–28; 20:11–21; 33:15–19). When people do not walk with God as He directs, His wrath is directed towards them (7:8–19; 8:17–9:10; et al.). Life in Ezekiel is to keep God's word or else know His wrath.

The problem that Ezekiel encounters with this theology is the reality that Israel continues to walk in wickedness rather than righteousness (20:11–21). But God, who has no pleasure in people dying (18:32), has a plan of restoring His wayward people. God will wash His people with water to cleanse them, and He will put His spirit within them to give them a heart that will keep His commandments (36:25–27). So shall they live and not die. Here water and spirit combine to bring new life as they do in John 3:5.

But this is hard to imagine, given the extreme distance that the people are from God and their state of degradation. Can a people such as this live? In the valley of dry bones, God gives the answer, "Yes!" (37:1–14). His prophet, the one whom God has sent, is called upon to speak to the bones and to call upon the breath to enter them. As they hear his voice, they are raised, and as the spirit enters them, they come to life. Here word, hearing, and spirit combine to bring new life.

Finally, in Ezekiel there is a picture of a stream that flows from the threshold of the new temple, ever deeper and deeper, bringing life wherever it goes. Here water and life are connected, not in a context of cleansing, but in a context of streams of water for a dry, thirsty land. The living water of John's Gospel (4:10–11; 7:38) appears to echo this thought.

Like John, Ezekiel connects God, hearing, water, and spirit with life. Other themes shared by both John and Ezekiel are also used in these contexts and will be taken up in chapter 3.

2 Words Used in the "I Am" Sayings

Scholarship has been keen to identify the "I am" sayings of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel as key ingredients in John's presentation of Jesus. Due to the importance of these sayings, it is appropriate to compare John's use of the vocabulary found in the sayings with Ezekiel.⁵⁵ Some words occur primarily in the context

55 It is impossible here to pursue a full discussion of the "I am" sayings. Considerable literature is available that investigates these sayings in detail. For excellent discussion of John's use of εἰμί see: Brown, *John*, 533–538. See also, Philip B. Habner, *The "I Am" of the Fourth*

of an “I am” saying (such as bread, door, shepherd, resurrection, vine and way) while others also occur in additional contexts (light and truth). The usage in the broader context of the Gospel will be discussed for each of these where appropriate. Life (used in two “I am” sayings) has already been covered above and will be omitted here. Some words are used by John in pairs (such as light and darkness, shepherd and sheep) and will be reviewed with their partners below.

A word must first be said about John’s use of εἰμί. Almost half of the occurrences of the word in the New Testament (141 times) appear in the Johannine literature, and 54 of these occurrences are in the Fourth Gospel. Forty-five times the word is uttered from the lips of Jesus, 38 of which include the emphatic use of the personal pronoun ἐγώ. Fifteen times it is used with a predicate nominative (with some duplications in the “I am” sayings), once agreeing with a usage attributed to Jesus (Son of God, 10:36), and once implying a predicate nominative (Teacher and Lord, 13:13). Often it is used in an absolute sense (4:26; 8:23, 28, and especially 58; 13:19; and is probably intended to be understood this way in 18:5, 8) connecting Jesus with the “I am” of Exodus 3:14⁵⁶ or “I am” sayings in Deutero-Isa.⁵⁷ The “I am” sayings, therefore, are profound statements of who Jesus is portrayed to be in the Fourth Gospel. Does Ezekiel provide the background for any of these sayings? If he does, then one might assume that Ezekiel was an important source for theology in the Gospel of John. At the outset, it is interesting to note that Ezekiel uses the recognition formula⁵⁸ “I am Yahweh” over 60 times in his prophecies.⁵⁹ The apparent parallel with John’s use of εἰμί is noteworthy.

2.1 Bread

Other than in a quotation from the Old Testament (13:18) and at the breakfast by the sea (21:9, 13) the context for John’s use of bread in the Fourth Gospel is the feeding of the multitude in the wilderness and the discourse which follows

Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and Thought, Biblical Series 26 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970). This present chapter seeks to discover the broad contours of John’s use of vocabulary in the “I am” sayings and compare it with Ezekiel.

56 Ibid., iii.

57 Brown, *John*, LX.

58 So designated by Walter Zimmerli, “The Message of the Prophet Ezekiel,” *Int* 23 (1969), 148.

59 Bowman would connect the “I am” of Jesus with the recognition formulas in Ezekiel, “I am (*Ani*) the LORD (*YHWH*),” and believes that Jesus claims to be *YHWH*. He cites Ezek 13:9; 23:49; 23:23, 28:24; and especially 29:16 as places where “I” could be taken to be the name of God; John Bowman, *The Fourth Gospel and the Jews: A Study in R. Akiba, Esther and the Gospel of John* (Pittsburg: Pickwick Press, 1975), 191.

(6:5–59). The allusion in that context to the children of Israel eating bread (manna) in the wilderness is unmistakable.⁶⁰ Moses' name is mentioned and the focus of the bread coming down out of heaven makes the Exodus connection undeniable. The Jewish expectation in Jesus' day was that the Messiah would come on Passover and that manna would again begin to fall.⁶¹ Having eaten bread from the hand of Jesus in the wilderness, the people want to take Jesus and make him king (6:15). Jesus sees the need to move people away from dependence upon a physical bread which leaves them hungry (6:35) and allows them to die (6:58) to partake of a spiritual bread that fills them and brings eternal life (6:35, 58). It is in this context that he proclaims, "I am the bread of life" (6:35, 48), and "I am the living bread which comes down out of heaven" (6:51). As the bread of life Jesus promises that "he who comes to me shall not hunger, and he who believes in me shall never thirst" (6:35). The discourse that follows makes it clear that life is to be found in a personal relationship to him, not in bread that perishes (6:27).⁶²

Bread in Ezekiel is usually mentioned in contexts of judgment on the iniquities of Israel. In Israel's time of judgment, her bread will be of mixed seeds and unclean (4:9–17). Ezekiel proclaims a lack of bread, famine, among the people in punishment for their sins (5:16; 14:13) and that they will eat their bread in fear (12:18–19). Only once is bread mentioned as a blessing and that is when God reminds Israel of His goodness in the past which she has rejected (16:19). Ezekiel knows nothing of a bread of life found in a relationship to God that satisfies the hunger of men, but he does share God's promise to feed His flock and lead them to rest (34:15). Ezekiel describes God's care for His people under a covenant of peace (34:25) where "there shall be showers of blessing" (34:26) and no famine (34:29). While using different vocabulary, the images are similar to John.

2.2 *Light*

John's dualistic language of light and darkness was once considered evidence of a Hellenistic background to the Gospel. The discoveries at Qumran revealed that this same dualistic language was deeply embedded in Jewish thought as well.⁶³ Light and darkness, life and death, good and evil—these are the pairs of words that express the conflict that Jesus encounters as he comes into the

60 Barrett, *John*, 282.

61 Brown, *John*, 265. Susan Hulen (*Allusion and Meaning in John 6* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005], 36) following Brown, argues that, here, Jesus "tells the crowd that their eschatological expectations of manna and Moses are fulfilled."

62 Filson, *Gospel of Life*, 113–114.

63 Ibid.

world on his mission from the Father.⁶⁴ He was the “light shining in the darkness” that the darkness resists but cannot take captive (1:5). His very coming reveals the character of men and thereby serves as a judgment upon them (3:19–21). To remain in the darkness is to reject God, but to believe in the light is to become a son of light (12:36).

Three times Jesus reveals himself as the light of the world (8:12; 9:5; 12:46). The key statement is in 8:12 at the Feast of Tabernacles.⁶⁵ Whereas the Feast celebrated God’s radiant presence with a festival of lights (recalling the Shekinah glory of God that preceded them on their journey in the wilderness), Jesus proclaims himself as the light of the world, and calls people to follow him as they followed the light of God in the wilderness.⁶⁶ He promises that all who believe and follow will never walk in darkness.

Closely related to light and darkness in the Gospel are day and night. These ideas express the window of opportunity that one has to work with the Father (9:4; 11:10–11). The light is not always available (9:5; 12:35–36) so people must take advantage of its presence while they can.

This dualistic emphasis of light and darkness is missing in Ezekiel. However, the reality that God’s presence can only be represented by brightness (1:4, 13, 26–28) and “the glory of the Lord” is readily found in Ezekiel. This last phrase, “the glory of the Lord,” was common in the Priestly writings and used to describe the “pillar of fire” that accompanied the Israelites in their journeys.⁶⁷ The connection of theophany (as in Ezek 1) with light was common for Israel,⁶⁸ but the main emphasis on “light” in the prophecies of Ezekiel is the fact that God will put out their lights in His judgment on sin (32:7–8). Still, He promises to rescue His people from where they have been scattered “on a day of clouds and thick darkness” (34:12).

2.3 *Door*

The theologically significant passages for the term “door” are found in John 10:1–9. Elsewhere (18:16–17; 20:19, 26) it is used with the common significance of an opening to a courtyard or house. Jesus refers parabolically to the thief who does not use the door (because he does not have legitimate access to the

64 Several additional themes and symbols might be included here. According to Culpepper, “the subordinate symbols for light are lamps, fires, torches, lanterns, day (and night), morning, seeing, and healing the blind,” *Anatomy*, 189.

65 Brown, *John*, 343.

66 G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco: Word, 1987), 128.

67 Bruce Vawter and Leslie J. Hoppe, *A New Heart. A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*, International Theological Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 29–30.

68 Beasley-Murray, *John*, 128.

sheep), and contrasts him with the shepherd (10:1–2).⁶⁹ But Jesus claims more than legitimate access, he claims to be the door of the sheep (10:7–9).⁷⁰ One cannot be considered part of the fold of God if he has not entered in through the door, Jesus, to be saved (10:9). Once one has entered by the door, then he has access through the door to pasture (10:9).⁷¹ The more important claim of Jesus, that he is the shepherd of the flock, is soon to follow (10:11).

Doors in Ezekiel are quite ordinary; usually a door in the temple is being referred to, once it is the door of a house. It is likely that no special significance is to be attached to doors in his prophecies. However, there may be a connection with the “gate” in the vision of Ezekiel’s new Temple (42–48).⁷² There is a gate (the east gate that God Himself entered by according to 44:2) that is to remain open on the Sabbath to provide the people access to the Temple (46:1). According to Ezek 46:1–12, the gate remains shut except on the days when the prince enters through it (and exits, 46:8) for worship. On those days the people can “go in and out” (46:10) with the prince. Once he leaves the gate is shut (46:12). This connection seems a bit strained until one remembers that the prince in Ezekiel is also the Good Shepherd (34:23, 24).

Martin also sees a link in John with Ezekiel at the point of the door imagery.⁷³ Preceding Jesus’ proclamation that he is the door is the pericope where the man who had been healed of his blindness was excommunicated from the synagogue (John 9:34). According to Martin:

Since Jesus healed the man born blind on the Sabbath day, he acts as the door to God’s new and true sanctuary, now located neither on Mount Gerizim nor in Jerusalem, where the people will worship the Father in spirit and in truth.⁷⁴

Likewise, Peterson sees a strong connection between Ezekiel and John with regard to Jesus as the door. The corrupt leadership of priests and false

69 Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 2, 281.

70 This carries with it the idea that Jesus mediates membership in the Messianic community and the blessings that go with it. See “θύρα,” *TDNT* 3:180.

71 There is a mixing of metaphors here that is confusing if one insists on fitting all of them together. The explanation that the shepherd of the sheep would sometimes sleep at the opening of the sheepfold and thus act as a door may be helpful, but it is not necessary to get the point of what Jesus is saying (Beasley-Murray, *John*, 169). He has legitimate access to the sheep as the shepherd, and participation in the flock of God is dependent upon one’s relationship to him as the door.

72 Cameron MacKay, “Ezekiel in the New Testament,” *CQR* 162 (1961), 10.

73 James Martin, “John 10:1–10,” *Int* 32 (1978), 173.

74 *Ibid.*

prophets, had not only neglected their sacred responsibilities, but had left Israel vulnerable. Peterson continues

These evil leaders had tried to get Israel to follow another way and enter into worship of Yahweh through a “door” of their own making. Prophet, priests, and rulers were all alike (Ezek 22:25–31). Priests had instituted idolatry and the worship of Tammuz as a means of approaching Yahweh (Ezek 8:1–18, esp. v. 14; cf. Jer. 7:18; 44:17–25). Prophets had directed the people falsely (Ezek 13:1–16), and prophetesses had used talismans and divination to circumvent the protective hand of Yahweh (Ezek 13:17–23). Ezekiel also declared that the prophets, priests, and leaders did not stand in the breaches/openings (תַּרְסִיט/ *perasot*) in the walls to protect Israel (Ezek 13:5; 22:30), clear shepherding imagery related to the “door” metaphor of John 10:1–10.⁷⁵

Furthermore, Ezekiel also has an emphasis on God Himself leading His sheep to pasture (34:14–16) and looking after them. But this emphasis is best seen under the image of shepherd.

2.4 *Shepherd*

John's Gospel refers to shepherd (ποιμήν) only in connection with the “I am” saying in John 10. However, there is also a reference to Jesus' sheep/lambs in John 21:16–17 where Peter is instructed to feed/tend (βόσχω/ποιμαίνω) the flock of Jesus.⁷⁶ The latter context is made comprehensible by the former where Jesus makes the claim, “I am the good shepherd” (10:11, 14).⁷⁷ In contrast to the stranger whose voice they will not follow, the sheep know and follow the voice of the shepherd (10:4–5, 27). In contrast to the thief who comes to steal and kill, the good shepherd comes that the sheep may have abundant and eternal life (10:10, 28). In contrast to the hireling who runs when danger threatens, the good shepherd meets danger and lays down his own life for the sheep as a free act of the will (10:11–13, 18). Jesus and the Father protect his sheep together because Jesus and the Father are one (10:28–29). If some people do not heed the works of Jesus, the good shepherd, the obvious conclusion is that it is because they are not his sheep for his sheep follow him (10:25–27).

Ezekiel also has a narrow focus on the image of shepherd, but it, too, is profound. The primary context is Ezek 34 (16 occurrences of ποιμήν in the LXX)

⁷⁵ Peterson, 141.

⁷⁶ Mackay sees the language here to be a reflection of Ezekiel 34; “Ezekiel,” 5.

⁷⁷ J. Ramsey Michaels, *John*, 360.

with an additional reference in 37:24. In Ezek 34 God is against the shepherds, the leaders, of Israel (false shepherds of John 10?) who are using the flock for their own advantage (the man born blind?). His flock is scattered, wounded and dying, and no one cares for them. God promises to intervene for the sheep; to search for them and find them, to rescue and gather them, and to feed (βόσχω) occurs 11 times) and protect them. He will give them a new shepherd, David, who will tend (ποιμαίνω occurs twice) them. And they will know that He is with them and that they are His people. Around the image of shepherd and sheep, and especially in these chapters, John 10 and Ezek 34, there is much common vocabulary and emphasis.⁷⁸ Additional exploration is merited and will be conducted in chapter 3.

2.5 Resurrection

The word resurrection, ἀνάστασις, is only used four times in the Fourth Gospel. It is first found in a context of judgment. The dead will hear the voice of the Son of man and come forth, those who have done good to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgment (5:27–29). The Father, of course, is the one who raises the dead (5:21). The Jewish leaders who are ready to kill Jesus due to his claims of relationship with the Father (5:18) are warned that they reject God by rejecting Jesus (5:23) and only by believing in Jesus can they escape judgment. There is a mixing of realized and futuristic eschatology here⁷⁹ that shows those who believe as already possessing eternal (spiritual) life (5:24) and yet pictures the dead awaiting the final (physical) resurrection (5:29). Resurrection here is a picture of an ultimate experience of entering into life or judgment, based upon one's actions in relationship to the Son of man.⁸⁰ It can be good or bad, depending upon whether or not one has responded in faith to Jesus.

In another context, Jesus declares himself to be “the resurrection and the life” in response to Martha's acknowledgement that her dead brother Lazarus will rise again in the resurrection at the last day (11:24–25). Martha's perspective is a futuristic eschatology, but Jesus insists that the resurrection is bound up in himself, not a future event.⁸¹ The blessings Jewish expectation longed for are

⁷⁸ Evans provides an impressive list of parallels in *Word and Glory*, 28–31.

⁷⁹ Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*, Reading the New Testament Series (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 126; or for a recent discussion, John T. Carroll, “Present and Future in Fourth Gospel ‘Eschatology,’” *BibThBul* 19 (1989), 63–68.

⁸⁰ Morris, *John*, 321–322.

⁸¹ Marsh, *John*, 428–429.

to be found in his own person.⁸² He then demonstrates the reality of his claim by calling Lazarus forth from the tomb (11:43). Men come alive in response to his voice, or they come under judgment when they reject his words (11:43–44; 5:24). Life, eschatological life in the kingdom of God, is real in relationship to Jesus who has authority to give it to whom he will (5:21).⁸³

While the term resurrection is not used in the Book of Ezekiel, one of the closest parallels to resurrection in the Old Testament is found in Ezek 37 where God brings to life an army in the valley of dry bones.⁸⁴ Ezekiel is told to prophesy to the dry bones that they may “hear the word of the Lord” (37:4). In response to his preaching, the dead are raised up and then the breath of life comes upon them. It is a picture of a renewed Israel—a people who are as good as dead in the grave of exile will again be made alive when they hear the voice of God.⁸⁵ The parallels between Ezekiel and John at this point will be granted closer scrutiny in chapter 3.

2.6 *Way*

The first of four occurrences of way (ὁδός) in the Gospel is found in a quotation by John the Baptist from Isa 40:3 in John 1:23, “I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, ‘Make straight the way of the Lord,’ as the prophet Isaiah said.” The term takes on profound significance in 14:6 where Jesus says, “I am the way, the truth and the life; no one comes to the Father, but by me.” Jesus had been talking about going away to the Father (13:33; 14:2) and had assured the disciples that they knew where he was going and the way. Thomas insisted otherwise, but Jesus assured him that he indeed knew the way because he knew Jesus. Here Jesus claims an exclusive authority to usher people into a relationship with God.⁸⁶ There is only one means of access to God and that is through him. To know him is to know the Father (14:9).

In the LXX of Ezekiel ὁδός is used 73 times.⁸⁷ Most often it refers to the works and deeds of people (their manner of life) and has a negative connotation because their ways are wicked.⁸⁸ Ezekiel can also speak of “the way of the Lord” which Israel sometimes complains is not just (18:29; 33:17, 20), but he assures

82 Beasley-Murray, *John*, 190.

83 Ibid.

84 Brown, *John*, 220.

85 Walter Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, Old Testament Library, trans. Cosslett Quin (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), 509–511.

86 “ὁδός,” *TDNT* 5:80.

87 Used more frequently in the Old Testament only in Psalms (100) and Proverbs (81); *ibid.*, 48.

88 *Ibid.*, 50–53.

them that it is their ways, not God's, that are unjust, and that they are being judged for them. At no point does Ezekiel use the term to suggest access to God and he never identifies a person as the way. The usage in John 14:6 would be foreign to Ezekiel. The closest he comes to a person showing the way is where he speaks of Oholibah, Jerusalem, following the way of her sister Oholah, Samaria, in wickedness (23:4, 5, 31).

2.7 *Truth*

That which is true is very important in the Fourth Gospel and to the Johannine community.⁸⁹ More than half of all the New Testament usages of the adjective ἀληθής, true, are found in John's Gospel (13 out of 25); the adjective ἀληθινός, true, is found 8 times in John;⁹⁰ and the noun ἀλήθεια, truth, is used 25 times in John. That which is true is veracious, genuine and authentic over against falsehood, lies, and sham.⁹¹

God, the Father who sent Jesus, is true (3:33; 7:28; 8:26); indeed, He is the only true God (17:3). Everything about Jesus is true; he is the true light (1:9), the true bread (6:32), the true vine (15:1), his judgment is true (8:16), his testimony is true (5:31; 8:14), and he is full of grace and truth (1:14, 17). He speaks the truth whether people believe him or not (8:40, 45, 46; 16:7) and those who receive his words then know the truth (17:8). Knowing the truth is important because when one knows the truth, that one is set free (8:32). Everyone who is of the truth hears (and heeds) Jesus' voice (18:37). Those who do not accept his truth reveal that they belong to their father the devil who is full of lies and has no truth in him (8:44). To worship God as a true worshipper, one must worship Him in spirit and in truth (4:23–24). Even the testimony of those who bear witness to him is affirmed as true (10:41; 19:35; 21:24).

Most amazing of all, Jesus can claim that he himself is "the truth" (14:6). He is the expression of the truth of who God is.⁹² And when the Spirit of Truth comes, who proceeds from the Father, he will guide those who follow Jesus into all truth because he will bear witness to Jesus (14:17; 15:26). In great irony, John shows Pilate standing before Jesus, the truth incarnate, unaware of who he really is, asking the question, "What is truth?" (18:38).⁹³ Every reader of the Gospel is well equipped to answer Pilate's question.

89 Brown, *John*, 499.

90 It is found in the Johannine literature 22 out of the 27 times it is used in the New Testament.

91 Dodd, *Interpretation*, 170–171.

92 Morris, *John*, 642.

93 Jesus had explained to Pilate that he had come "to bear witness to the truth" (18:37). Truth here and at other points in the Fourth Gospel implies the notion of "the divine plan of

Ezekiel has none of John's vocabulary of truth. But the whole of the Old Testament tends to neglect these terms as well, with the exception of the Psalms and Proverbs. For Ezekiel, the true was the *δίκαιος*, that which was what it was supposed to be.⁹⁴ Ezekiel uses *δίκαιος* 19 times, John only 3. He uses *δικαιοσύνη* 22 times, John twice. At this point there seems to be little that they share together.

2.8 *Vine*

In a metaphor from the vineyard, Jesus presents himself as the "true vine" in John 15. The point is that men need to live in a dependent relationship to him if they are to be fruitful and maintain life in relationship to God.⁹⁵ The Father himself tends the vine and its branches and demands the fruitfulness which will come naturally if the branch will abide in the vine.⁹⁶ Jesus is the true vine, as opposed to any other possible source of life with God.

Ezekiel utilizes an imagery of the vine in three contexts. The first of these is 15:1–8 where he compares Israel to a vine which is worthless as a fuel for fire or to make pegs upon which to hang things. In the second, 17:5–21, the vine is a symbol for a king who has broken covenant with the one who made him king, and in the end he will wither away and die. In the final one, 19:10–14, Israel is compared to a vine that was once luxurious, but which was plucked up, cast aside, withered and was finally burned. This last passage has many parallels to the branch which does not abide in the vine in John's Gospel. Here is another area in which further research may prove fruitful.

3 Other Significant Words and Phrases

There are other important words in the Fourth Gospel which do not occur as often as fifty times, nor in any of the "I am" sayings, and yet deserve careful consideration. The maxim that words need to be weighed and not counted is certainly applicable for the following terms that are key ingredients in Johannine thought.

salvation"; Ignace de la Potterie, "The Truth in Saint John," in *The Interpretation of John*, ed. John Ashton (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 53–66.

94 In the OT, righteous and righteousness had to do with fulfilling one's obligations to God; See "*δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη*," *TDNT* 2:182, 185, 196.

95 Paul S. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 42.

96 *Ibid.*

3.1 Word

A study of John's theological vocabulary would seem incomplete if it did not include his use of λόγος and ῥήμα. John uses λόγος 40 times in the Gospel and ῥήμα twelve times. Whereas λόγος, the word, is most often used in the singular (except 10:19; 14:23, 24), ῥήμα is always used in the plural, words. It appears that the λόγος tends to focus on a particular concept, thought, or content while ῥήμα relates to the individual words that are used to express that content.⁹⁷ At times the two terms are used almost synonymously.⁹⁸ Jesus accuses the crowd of not being able to hear God's word (λόγος) (8:43), or God's words (ῥήματα) (8:47). Both the words (ῥήματα) which Jesus speaks (3:34; 14:10) and the word (λόγος) which people hear (14:24) do not belong to Jesus, but come from the Father who sent him. Jesus' words (ῥήματα) can abide in the believer (15:7) while God's word (λόγος) does not abide in those who do not believe (5:38). Men are capable of believing both the words of Jesus (ῥήματα) (5:47), and the word of Jesus (λόγος) (2:22; 4:50). Belief in the one who sent Jesus can follow hearing either the word of Jesus (λόγος) (5:24), or his words (ῥήματα) (17:8). In the same context men can be offended by Jesus' words (λόγοι) (10:19), while others defend his words (ῥήματα) (10:21). Jesus gives the disciples both the words of God (ῥήματα) (17:8), and the word of God (λόγος) (17:14). And yet some distinction seems to remain. Men can be said to *receive* the words of Jesus (ῥήματα) (12:47; 17:8), but only the word of Jesus (λόγος) can be said to have been *kept* (8:51–52; 14:23–24; 15:20; 17:6).

Beyond the Prologue, John's usage tends to conform to that of other New Testament writers.⁹⁹ The λόγος can be a way of referring to God's voice heard through the scriptures (10:35; 15:25), and it can be used in the sense of testimony (4:39; 17:20), promise (4:50), a saying (4:37; 15:20; 21:23), and prophecy (2:22; 12:38; 18:9, 32). Sometimes it refers to a particular statement that captures attention (6:60; 7:36, 40; 19:8, 13).¹⁰⁰ More often, the λόγος refers to the witness and teaching that Jesus bears from the Father (4:41; 5:24, 38; 8:31; 12:47–48; 14:23–24; 15:20; 17:6, 14, 17). At times it almost has the force of "commandment" (14:23; 17:6). John can speak both of keeping Jesus' word (8:51–52; 14:23–24; 15:20; 17:6) and his commandments (14:15; 15:10). The one who loves him is said to do both (compare 14:15 and 14:23).

97 Dodd, *Interpretation*, 265–267.

98 Bultmann, *John*, 541; and Morris, *John*, 125.

99 "λέγω, λόγος, ῥήμα, λαλέω," *TDNT* 4:128.

100 Once in the plural in reference to a number of things which Jesus has been saying to the crowd (10:19).

Jesus' teaching—both the words (ῥήματα) which Jesus speaks (3:34; 14:10) and the word (λόγος) which people hear (14:24)—does not originate with him, but comes from the Father who sent him (14:10, 24). The word/s of Jesus are associated with life and spirit (5:24; 6:63, 68), and with truth (8:31–32; 17:17). Indeed, when Jesus leaves, the Spirit will carry on his ministry of teaching the disciples the word of God (14:18–25). How one responds to the word/s of Jesus reveals his relationship to the Father (8:42–47). To reject his words results in being judged by his word (12:48). To respond positively to his word brings life (5:24) and the promise that the one who does will never taste death (8:51–52). Continuing in Jesus' word brings the Father's presence into one's life (14:23), marks that person as a disciple of Jesus (8:31), sets a person free (8:32), and enables an effective prayer life (15:7). The word is the means by which cleansing comes (15:3). In addition, there is a dynamic relationship between the words and deeds of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel—both come from the Father and both have a revelatory function in the ministry of Jesus.¹⁰¹

John is unique in the way he uses λόγος in the Prologue to refer to Jesus.¹⁰² Attempts at an explanation of John's use in the Prologue lie at the heart of the inquiry into the background to the Fourth Gospel. The debate on the ideological origin of the Gospel, though not limited to a discussion of λόγος (his dualistic language has also been a point of contention), has often been focused on this term.¹⁰³ If it can be determined that John writes with a basic Hellenistic understanding of λόγος, i.e., the rational principle permeating all of reality,¹⁰⁴ then there would be strong reasons to assume a dominant Hellenistic influence in the rest of the Gospel. However, if a more Jewish perspective is being expressed, i.e. the creative power of God in action or the guiding purpose of God at work in history,¹⁰⁵ then one expects to find a strong Jewish flavor in

101 Brown, *John*, 622, 632–33.

102 It is unique for John from the rest of the NT ("λόγος," *TDNT* 4:128), and unique from the rest of the Fourth Gospel (Dodd, *Interpretation*, 268). A possible explanation for this difference is the hypothesis that John used a hymn as source material for the Prologue. Like an overture in an opera that introduces its themes, John could have used or adapted an early hymn to introduce the Gospel "because it perfectly expressed his theology concerning Jesus"; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (Word Biblical Themes; Dallas: Word Publishing, 1989), 21.

103 Some examples include: Brown, *John*, lvi–lviii; Bultmann, *John*, 19–36; and Morris, *John*, 115–126.

104 This brief description follows that provided by A. M. Hunter, *The Gospel According to John* (Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 16.

105 *Ibid.*

what follows as well. It is possible that John was aware of both and purposefully used λόγος to establish common ground with all possible readers.¹⁰⁶ The literature on the subject is extensive and a review of it lies beyond the scope of this study. We assume as true the position of Schnackenburg, who traces the origin of the λόγος concept in the Prologue to the Old Testament and Jewish Wisdom literature.¹⁰⁷ However, a brief look at how Jesus functions as the Word in the Fourth Gospel is in order.

Jesus is the Word (λόγος) in John's Prologue. His identity is not immediately expressed but it becomes clear by 1:15. The full import of this concept continues to be a matter of debate. What can be stated positively is that the Word was pre-existent with the Father, shared His essential nature, and was the intermediate agent of all creation (1:1–3).¹⁰⁸ The Word is the source of life, and functions as the light of men which darkness cannot overcome (1:4–5). The Word became flesh and functioned as the revealer of the glory of God (1:14, 18). The exegesis of the person, presence, power, and purpose of God takes place in the person of Jesus Christ, the Word (1:18, 5:19; 6:29; 14:9–10, 18).¹⁰⁹

Turning to Ezekiel one finds an abundant use of the word or words. In the LXX one finds λόγος used 77 times and ῥῆμα three times.¹¹⁰ When ῥῆμα is used (33:31, 32; 38:10) it is always in reference to the words of men and never of God, but λόγος can be used to refer to the words of God and men (e.g., 2:6–7). On fifty occasions Ezekiel uses λόγος in the solemn pronouncement, “The word of the Lord came to me.”¹¹¹ On ten other occasions he exhorts various people to “Hear the word of the Lord.” There is a dynamic connection between the words of Ezekiel and his symbolic acts.¹¹² At some points the distinction between the act and oracle is not formally made.¹¹³ An important emphasis on “the word of the Lord” in his prophecies is that everything he says and does originates

106 Ibid.

107 Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 483.

108 These were claims made for the Torah in Wisdom literature—here they describe Jesus; Barrett, *John*, 155.

109 If it is true that Jesus, the Word, comes as the means by which God expresses Himself among men, then the scales lean toward a more Jewish, less Hellenistic, background to John's use of λόγος. If John was aware of the Hellenistic connotations of λόγος, then he seems to be making a bold statement in the Gospel that the λόγος is not some impersonal, rational force, but the personal expression of a very personal God. Hunter, *John*, 15–16.

110 The MT uses the same word, דָּבָר (*dabar*), in all of these instances.

111 All the literary sections of the book begin with the phrase: “The word of the Lord came to me”; Wevers, 15. It is noteworthy that John begins the Gospel with the Word coming to humanity as well.

112 “Even the symbolic act was considered to be ‘the word of Yahweh’”; *ibid.*

113 Ibid.

in God and not in himself. This is in distinction to those who claim to speak a word from God but whom God does not acknowledge as being sent from Him (13:1–16). God has something important to say and the people need to listen to “the word” which comes through his prophet.

When one eliminates the 60 “formula” occurrences from consideration, Ezekiel’s use of the term becomes less extensive, but no less important. God’s word in Ezekiel tends to be a word of warning (3:17; 33:7) to the house of Israel. It includes words of lamentation, mourning, and woe because it is a word that speaks of judgment upon Israel’s wickedness (2:7–10). While the fulfillment of His word may tarry, there will come a time when He will work to perform it with no more delay (12:21–28). From the beginning God makes it clear that those to whom Ezekiel is sent may reject His word (2:5), but the commission that he receives is to speak God’s words to the people whether they will listen or not (2:7; 3:4, 10–11). God’s word, not their words, is to set the parameters for the ministry of Ezekiel (2:6–7).

The emphasis on Ezekiel being sent with the word/s of God to the people of God who do not listen is a remarkable parallel to what is seen in the ministry of Jesus. The fact that those who do not heed the word they hear will die in their iniquity/sin is common to both as well (Ezek 3:17–19; John 8:21–24). The connection of words and deeds in the ministries of Ezekiel and Jesus is another parallel. One other observation is notable. The Spirit of God is dynamically involved with Ezekiel in his calling and ministry as the one sent from God with the word of God (Ezek 2:1–7; 3:4–27; 11:5). This too is an emphasis in the Gospel, “For he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit” (John 3:34). Usage and associations in regard to “the word” tend to indicate an intertextual echo.

3.2 *Witness*

The Fourth Gospel is a gospel of witness¹¹⁴ to the person and work of Jesus so that men may believe that he is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing they may have life in his name (20:31). The verb μαρτυρέω is used 33 times and the noun μαρτυρία occurs 14 times. The people who appear in the Gospel come to bear witness to the identity of Jesus: John declares, “Behold the Lamb of God,” and “this is the Son of God” (1:7, 19–23, 29–36); Andrew testifies, “We have found the Messiah” (1:40–41); Philip bears witness, “We have found him of whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote,” (1:45); Nathaniel exclaims, “Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel” (1:49), and so

¹¹⁴ James M. Boice shows how this theme is developed throughout the Gospel in his monograph, *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970).

forth. Even Pilate is compelled to bear witness at the cross: “Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews” (19:19). Not only people but also the works of Jesus bear witness to him (5:36; 10:25), the scriptures bear witness to him (5:39), the Father bears witness (8:18), and when the Spirit of Truth comes, he will bear witness to Jesus (15:26). Signs also bear witness to him (2:11). The whole import of the Gospel is to reveal Jesus! The language has a judicial flavor. There has been ample testimony given, what awaits is a verdict from the reader which can only be to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. And just in case there should be any doubt, the Gospel affirms that the witness to the witnesses and their testimony is true (19:35; 21:24).

John’s vocabulary of witness is completely absent in the Book of Ezekiel. This may not be entirely surprising considering that the words John uses are only found 19 times in all of the LXX, but μαρτύριον is fairly common.¹¹⁵ Still, Ezekiel does bear witness, or rather warning, to the people of God. He is sent to deliver the words of God (2:7), he is a watchman over the house of Israel (3:17, et al.), and he is a sign to them (24:24). He functions very much as God’s witness in the judicial proceedings that God has with His rebellious people as He calls them into judgment. The veracity of his testimony is affirmed by his repeated use of the introductions: “The word of the Lord came to me” or “As the Lord lives.” But there is still nothing of John’s vocabulary here and one must look elsewhere for connections between the evangelist and the prophet.

3.3 *Glory*

Bultmann emphasizes the theme of glory found throughout John’s Gospel in his outline: Prologue, The Revelation of the δόξα to the World, The Revelation of the δόξα to the Community, and Postscript.¹¹⁶ This outline captures the importance of the theme of glory for John. John uses the noun δόξα 19 times and the verb δοξάζω 23 times.¹¹⁷ There are occasions when he uses the noun with the sense of honor or praise (5:41, 44; 9:24; 12:43) and on one occasion the verb is perhaps used in this regard (8:54). In these contexts the thought of giving due respect, esteem and credit seem to be the import of δόξα. However, for John there is a much loftier significance attached to δόξα and especially to δοξάζω. Glory in other contexts points to the magnificence that belongs to

115 It occurs over 250 times in the LXX, mainly in the Pentateuch, and it is rare among the prophets (8 times).

116 Rudolf Bultmann, *John*, vii–xii.

117 Only Paul (13) and Luke (9) come close. The glorification of the Father and the Son are important for John. W. Robert Cook affirms that glory “is not merely a motif *in* ... but it is the motif *of* the Johannine corpus,” in “The ‘Glory’ Motif in the Johannine Corpus,” *JETS* 27 (1984), 297.

the very character and nature of God (1:14; 12:41; 17:4–5), and to glorify Him (or Jesus) is to make manifest that magnificence (11:4; 12:28).

When God is revealed as present and at work in His world, it is His glory that is made evident (11:4, 40), and nowhere is God's majestic presence more evident than in the person and work of Jesus (14:9–13; 17:4). The Word made flesh who dwelt among men revealed the glory of God (1:14). Indeed, the glory of the Father and the Son are inextricably linked (11:4; 12:23, 28; 13:31–32; 14:3; 17:1). It is a glory they shared before the foundation of the world (17:5, 24), but throughout the ministry of Jesus it is the glory of the Father he seeks (7:18; 8:50; 17:1). The glorification of Jesus comes partially through the signs that he performs (2:11), but it will come pre-eminently through the resurrection (7:39; 12:16; 13:31; 17:5), and, for those who can see it, even in the crucifixion (3:14; 12:23–32).¹¹⁸ Jesus will also be glorified by the Spirit (16:14) and through his disciples (17:10). And the Father, too, will be glorified through the fruitful lives of the disciples (15:8).

The Book of Ezekiel, like the Gospel of John, opens with an emphasis on God's glory being demonstrated in the midst of His people (1:1–28). Ezekiel experiences a theophany of God's glorious presence; however, the emphasis is not on God's grace and truth, but on His holiness. Fire and brightness are prominent. Ezekiel falls on his face before the glory of God (1:28). Later, in Ezekiel's vision of the temple (chapters 8–11) there is an account of the corruption going on in the temple and at the same time a description of the glory of God resting above it. God's glory, the same glory Ezekiel saw in chapter 1, moves from above the temple (10:4) to the east gate (10:19) and eventually out of the city entirely (11:23). It is a picture of God completely removing His presence in response to the wickedness that is conducted in the temple. The glory of God does not appear again until Ezekiel's final vision of a new temple (chapters 40–48). God's glory finally returns to dwell with His people forever in the new temple (43:2–5; 44:4). Meanwhile God is glorified through the acts of judgment that He executes (28:22; 39:13, 39).

As with John, for Ezekiel the glory of God is a major concern.¹¹⁹ And the understanding that God's glory is made manifest through what He does is common to both. Ezekiel's strong association of the temple with the glory of God

¹¹⁸ Barrett points to the special use of *δοξάζειν* as a description of the death of Jesus where he dies as Son of God and obedient servant and is thereby lifted up on the cross and exalted to heaven; *John*, 166. Culpepper agrees that "the cross is his glorification, which finally reveals his glory for all to see;" *Anatomy*, 88. This crucifixion/glorification theme is one of John's greatest ironies.

¹¹⁹ In the LXX, the word *δόξα* only appears in the Psalms and Isaiah more often than in the prophecies of Ezekiel.

could appear to be absent in John until one remembers that John's Jesus is intent on cleansing the temple, and in the same context refers to himself in such a way as to imply that he is the replacement of the temple (John 2:13–22). While John's reference to beholding the glory of the Word made flesh dwelling among us is most likely to be related to the children of Israel's experience of the Shekinah of God in the Exodus,¹²⁰ perhaps one can also recognize the glory of God manifest in the replacement of the temple, namely, Jesus.¹²¹ If Jesus' death and resurrection are related to his glorification, then to destroy the temple and in three days to raise it again certainly connects the theme of glory to the temple in John as well as Ezekiel. Whether or not this can be established remains to be seen and will be taken up in the discussion of "The New Temple" in chapter 3.

3.4 *Judgment*

Another important theme in the Gospel is the theme of judgment.¹²² John uses κρίνω 19 times, κρίσις 11 times, and κρίμα once. A certain irony surrounds this theme. It is clearly stated that God did not send Jesus into the world to judge it, rather he was sent in order to save it (3:17; 12:47), and yet the effect of his coming is judgment, κρίμα (9:39). Those who do not believe, who reject the love of God expressed in the Son, are judged by their own rejection of Jesus (3:18). In their choice of darkness instead of the light, they experience judgment, the reality of being cut off from God and consigned to live in the darkness which they have chosen (3:19). Jesus has no need to judge these because his word will judge them on the last day (12:48). And yet all judgment has been given to him by the Father (5:22) and he indeed has many things to say and to judge of the people (8:26). At one point, Jesus calls upon the Jewish leaders not to judge according to appearances but to "judge with right judgment" (7:24).¹²³

There is a note of irony, or ambiguity, over who serves as judge in the realm of judgment. It is stated that the Father judges no one but has given this work to the son in order that they might honor the Son as they do the Father

120 Barnabas Lindars, *John* (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1990), 77.

121 "The rabbis speak of the Shekinah as the dwelling of God, pre-eminently in the temple"; Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovTSup 23; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 205–206.

122 Bultmann maintains that the first part of the Gospel (the revelation of the glory of Jesus to the world in chapters 3–12) "may be summarized by the word κρίσις; for the struggle of the revelation is portrayed as κρίσις, in the double sense of 'judgement' (sic) and 'division.'" This division he sees specifically portrayed in 6:66ff; *John*, 111.

123 Schnackenburg sees this expression as being closely akin to "κρίμα κρίνεν," which often occurs in the LXX (Isa 16:5; Jer 21:12; Ezek 44:24; Zech 8:16); *John*, vol. 2, 472.

(5:22–23). The son is given the authority to have life in himself as the Father had life (5:26) and presumably to give life to whom he will as judge. Indeed, it is in response to his voice that the dead will be raised to a resurrection of life or of judgment (5:28–29). And yet all of this he does, not on his own authority, but according to what he hears from the one who sent him (5:30). Bultmann explains, “we see that it means that God exercises his office as Judge through the Son.”¹²⁴ So when the son (who claims he does not judge in 8:15) judges, it is only in connection with the Father (8:16) who remains the judge of those who dishonor the son (8:50). Despite the explanation by Bultmann the ambiguity is never fully resolved.

One additional note of ambiguity is over the eschatological significance of judgment. Is it realized, or futuristic? The realized aspect is prominent. Those who do not believe are judged, condemned, already (3:18). Whoever hears the word of the son and believes already “has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death into life” (5:24). “The hour is coming, *and now is*, when the dead will hear the voice of the son of God and those who hear will live” (5:25). The judgment of the world happens in the now of Jesus’ presence and work in the world (12:31). And yet Jesus can speak of an hour that is coming when the ones in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth to a resurrection of life or of judgment (5:28–29), and of a judgment “in the last day” (12:47). While the present fact of judgment in regard to what one does with Jesus is primary, the future aspect does not totally disappear.

What can be said positively is that one’s response to Jesus determines one’s experience of judgment. Hearing and believing in Jesus removes one from condemnation, and brings salvation and life (3:16; 5:24; 12:47). Not to believe is to be already judged (3:18–19) and to await a judgment “in the last day” (12:48). In the meanwhile, the whole world is divided between those who believe and those who do not, those who have life and those who are in death.

As one would expect in the message of an Old Testament prophet, Ezekiel abounds in the language of judgment. The LXX of Ezekiel has 19 occurrences of κρίνω, two of κρίσις, 23 of κρίμα, and uses κριτής once.¹²⁵ Eleven times God promises to execute judgments upon His people for their wickedness. The primary tone is that of punishment for sin. However, on three occasions God addresses Ezekiel as “son of man” and calls on him to “judge” His people (20:4; 22:2; 23:36). This consists basically of declaring to them their evil deeds. A slight parallel might exist here with the Paraclete of John who convicts the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment (John 16:8–11). In another passage, God

¹²⁴ Bultmann, *John*, 256.

¹²⁵ Like John, Ezekiel does not use κατάκρισις, but κατάκρισις does not occur at all in the LXX.

commits judgment into the hand of the Babylonians (23:24). There is a slight parallel here with God committing judgment into the hand of Jesus (John 5:22) so that God executes His judgment through another. A more probable parallel is the image of Ezekiel being given the words of warning that men must heed or else face judgment (3:17–21). This compares very well with the emphasis in John on people needing to hear and believe the words of Jesus in order to escape judgment. Still, the connection between these passages is tenuous based upon the usage of judgment terminology alone.

3.5 Water

The theme of water might at first seem a bit absurd in regard to Johannine theology until one observes the use of ὕδωρ in the Gospel and compares it with the rest of the New Testament. Over half of the total occurrences of the word appear in Johannine literature and the most frequent usage of the term is found in John's Gospel.¹²⁶ Culpepper observes:

The image of water appears surprisingly frequently and with the most varied associations of any of John's symbols. There are conversations about water, water pots, rivers, wells, springs, the sea, pools, basins, thirst, and drink.¹²⁷

So water plays a significant role here.¹²⁸ People are baptized in water (1:26, 31, 33). Water is used in the first recorded miracle, or sign, of Jesus as he turns water into wine (2:1–11). Before a person can enter the kingdom of God one must be born of water and the Spirit (3:5). The woman at the well is told about living water that springs up unto eternal life (4:7–15). Spiritually thirsty people who believe in Jesus are invited to come to him and drink of the rivers of living water (7:38–39). One man lies by a pool of water waiting for healing that only Jesus can bring (5:1–8) while another man is told to wash in a pool of water (though the term is not mentioned in this context) and is given his sight (9:1–7). Jesus washes the feet of the disciples with a basin of water (13:3–12).

¹²⁶ Of 79 occurrences of the term in the New Testament, 24 appear in the Gospel (including three weak variant readings). Except for the book of Revelation (18 occurrences), ὕδωρ is found in the Fourth Gospel more than three times as often as in any other New Testament book. This frequency highlights a theological significance.

¹²⁷ Culpepper proposes water as one of the three core symbols of the gospel with light and bread; *Anatomy*, 189.

¹²⁸ An extended treatment of this theme in the Fourth Gospel is provided by Birger Olsson, *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Textual-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1–11 and John 4:1–42*, trans. J. Gray (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1974), 212–218.

And finally, from the side of Jesus where the soldier has pierced him with a spear there flows out blood and water (19:34).¹²⁹

So, for John, water is connected with the initiation into a new life (1:26). It is closely related to the work of the Spirit (3:5) and the outpouring of the Spirit (7:39). It is also related to eternal life (4:14), and it can be referred to as “living water” (4:10; 7:38). It serves to heal (9:1–7) and to cleanse (13:3–12). It flows from the crucified one (19:34).

There is an abundance of water in Ezekiel as well. The wings of the cherubim sound like “the sound of many waters” (1:24) as does the coming of the glory of God (43:2). Early prophecies refer to the scarcity of water as a judgment on the iniquity of the children of Israel (4:11, 16–17; 12:18–19). When God found the outcast child, Israel, He bathed her with water (16:9). Abundant waters nourish a young cedar tree (a Jewish king in 17:1–16, and a Pharaoh in 31:1–32:31) only to be taken away in judgment when pride leads to wickedness. Knees can be as “weak as water” (7:17; 21:7). The water that slakes the thirst of the sheep can be muddied by the strong who trample it (34:18).

Perhaps the two most important contexts in which water is used in Ezekiel are 36:22–36 and 47:1–19. In the first of these God promises to renew His people. He says:

I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will take out of your flesh the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances (36:25–27).

Here Ezekiel connects water with cleansing, the gift of the Spirit, and abundance (36:29, 35).

Finally, in chapter 47 Ezekiel shares a vision of a river of water flowing from the threshold of the new temple (47:1). It flows out, deeper and deeper as it flows, and brings life wherever it goes (47:3–9). Fishermen spread their nets and catch fish along the Great Sea into which it flows and makes fresh (47:10–11). Trees grow up along the river and their leaves provide healing (47:12). Again

¹²⁹ It might also be mentioned that Jesus calls his disciples from the sea where they have been fishing (and where they have subsequently caught a great catch of fish at his direction) to a breakfast on the shore (21:1–14). While ὕδωρ is missing in favor of Θάλασσα, the connection with water here is interesting in light of the connection of water and fish found in Ezek 47 where fishermen take fish from the river of water that flows from the Temple.

one finds the related themes of water, life, and renewal that are found in the Fourth Gospel. That such connections were common in the Old Testament, even in the ancient Orient, is not denied.¹³⁰ What is significant here is that Ezekiel and John utilize the theme of water in a similar fashion. These images will be examined further in chapter 3.

3.6 *Spirit*

In contrast to the Synoptic Gospels where references to the Spirit are few, in the Fourth Gospel “they are numerous and striking.”¹³¹ John uses πνεῦμα 24 times. Five times it seems to be used with the sense of “spiritual” in contrast to “fleshly, earthly, and world-bound” existence; that which is born of the flesh is flesh over against that which is born of the Spirit is spirit (3:6), God is spirit and those who worship Him must do so in spirit and in truth (4:23–24), the words that Jesus shares are spirit (6:63). Twice spirit is used to denote the inner person of Jesus; he was deeply moved (11:33) and troubled (13:21) in his spirit. Once it may refer to Jesus’ life as he gives up his spirit on the cross (19:30).¹³² The rest of the occurrences relate to the Spirit whom church tradition knows as the third person of the Trinity. John is unique in his attribution of the term παράκλητος, Paraclete, to the Spirit on four occasions¹³³ (14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7). Three times he refers to the Spirit as the Spirit of truth (14:17; 15:26; 16:13) and three times as the Holy Spirit (1:33; 14:26; 20:22). The terms appear to be various means of referring to the same Spirit-Paraclete (1:33; 14:16–17, 26). Smalley observes:

[B]oth the nature and ministry of the Paraclete, as described in the Johannine farewell discourse, are consistent with the person and work of the (Holy) Spirit as presented elsewhere in John....¹³⁴

Jesus is the bearer of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel. At the beginning of his ministry the Spirit descended upon him and *remained* (1:32–33). Jesus is the

¹³⁰ Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 427.

¹³¹ Barrett, *John*, 88.

¹³² It is possible here to see John making a statement about the giving of the Spirit that was to take place after Jesus was glorified (7:38–39). This may not seem to be a natural way to express such an idea, but John is prone to double entendre (13:30). Still, perhaps it is best to see the giving of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel at 20:22.

¹³³ Brown mistakenly claims that John uses the term five times both in his Anchor Bible commentary, *John*, 1135, and his article, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 13 (1967), 113. In the fifth instance claimed by Brown, John actually refers to the Spirit of Truth (16:12–14), though it appears obvious that this title is synonymous with Paraclete.

¹³⁴ Stephen S. Smalley, *John, Evangelist and Interpreter* (Greenwood: Attic Press, 1978), 231.

one who then bestows the Spirit upon men; he will baptize with the Holy Spirit (1:33), and will breathe the Holy Spirit into his followers (20:22). The ultimate source of the Spirit is the Father who sends the Spirit in Jesus' name (14:26; 15:26), but Jesus also sends the Spirit of truth from the Father (15:26).¹³⁵ During the ministry of Jesus the Spirit-Paraclete dwells *with* men, but in the future he shall be *in* them (14:17). This coming of the Spirit upon men awaits the glorification of the Son (7:39). Indeed, the Son gives over, παραδίδωμι, his spirit (Spirit?) from the cross (19:30) as water flows from his side (7:39; 19:34).¹³⁶

The Spirit is the agent of regeneration and new life in the Fourth Gospel (6:63). One must be born from above, of water and the Spirit, in order to enter the kingdom of God (3:3–5). There is a certain mystery surrounding the Spirit as the mystery of the wind (3:8). The Spirit is the living water (7:38–39) that becomes in the believer a well of water springing up into eternal life (4:14).

The Spirit continues the ministry of Jesus and can be said to be another, ἄλλος, Paraclete (just like Jesus). It is implied that he will make Jesus' presence real to them (14:16–20). He will continue to teach the disciples as Jesus did (14:26). He will bear witness to Jesus (15:26). He will take the things of Jesus and declare them to the disciples (16:14). He will glorify Jesus (16:14). And he will guide the disciples into all truth (16:23).

The Spirit also has a ministry in the world even though the world cannot know him (14:17). He will function not as an advocate (one possible translation of paraclete) but as a prosecutor. He will convict the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment (16:7–8).

According to Brown, John's description of the ministry of the Spirit provides little in the way of variation from the emphases supplied by other New Testament writers.¹³⁷ If there is a difference between John's emphasis on the Spirit-Paraclete and that of the rest of the New Testament, it could only be that in the Fourth Gospel the Paraclete is more personal.¹³⁸

In Ezekiel, the Spirit of God is prominent as well. Zimmerli points out the significance of this:

¹³⁵ It is difficult to tell whether the source of the Spirit in John 3:34 is the Father or Jesus: "he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit." It would appear that the focus is on Jesus being able to speak God's words because God has fully endowed him with the Spirit.

¹³⁶ Can it be that here John is making a theological statement in regard to the giving of the Spirit? John is certainly capable of such symbolism. See note 132.

¹³⁷ Brown, *John*, 1139.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

Classical literary prophecy before Ezekiel—Amos, Hosea, Isa, and even Jeremiah—resolutely avoids speaking of “spirit” as that power which authorizes the prophet. Was this because the “man of the spirit” was connected so strongly with outward oddness which attracted attention and caused the prophets to appear as “crazy?” Ezekiel, in contrast, does not hesitate to speak of the “spirit.”¹³⁹

The word used 49 times by Ezekiel in the MT is רִיחַ (*ruach*), which is translated variously as wind (14 times), mind (twice), side (as in east side, or east wind, four times), breath (four times), and spirit (25 times). The Septuagint translates *ruach* with ἄνεμος (wind, seven times), θυμός (anger, twice), καρδία (heart, once), and πνεῦμα (37 times), and the corresponding terms for east, west, north, and south once each. The prevailing emphasis here is on the Spirit.

Sometimes spirit is used with the sense of “life” or “life principle” as in the spirit of the living creatures being located in the wheels (1:12, 20, 21; 17:17). It can indicate the inner life of the prophet (3:14). Most often it is used to identify God’s power moving upon and working through the life of Ezekiel. The Spirit enters him (2:2; 3:24), sets him on his feet (2:2), lifts him up (3:12, 14; 8:3; 11:1, 24; 43:5), takes him to various places (3:14; 8:3; 11:1, 24; 37:1; 43:5), and falls on him (11:5).¹⁴⁰ The Spirit enables him to face both God (2:1–2) and men (3:10–15) and the Spirit imparts revelation (11:5).¹⁴¹ Therefore, Ezekiel is a man sent from God who is able to utter the words of God because God has set His Spirit upon him.¹⁴²

The people to whom God has sent Ezekiel have a serious problem. They are wayward and rebellious and seem set for judgment (3:7). But God has a plan for them. He calls for them to cast away their transgressions and get a new heart and a new spirit (18:31). How will this be possible? God Himself will sprinkle water on them and make them clean, He will give them a new heart, and will put His spirit within them so that they will walk in His statutes and observe His ordinances (36:25–27). They will become a new people from within by the work of God’s spirit.

Is this hard to imagine? Can God’s people come to life again? In the valley of dry bones God’s answer is a resounding “Yes!” Ezekiel is told to prophesy to the dry bones and tell them that God will cause breath (*ruach*/πνεῦμα) to enter them so that they may live (37:4–6). Then Ezekiel is told to prophesy to the

¹³⁹ Zimmerli, “Message of Ezekiel,” 135.

¹⁴⁰ This is close to the usage of “the hand of the Lord” (1:3; 3:14; 8:1); Keith W. Carley, *Ezekiel Among the Prophets: A Study of Ezekiel’s Place in the Prophetic Tradition* (Studies in Biblical Theology 31; Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1974), 25, 29.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 27.

¹⁴² Compare to John 3:34.

wind (*ruach*/πνεῦμα) and call on it to breathe on them (37:9), and they come to life. God assures Israel that in the same way He will put His Spirit within them and they will live (37:14).

Several parallels with the Fourth Gospel emerge in regard to the Spirit. God's Spirit enables witness to God and a warning of judgment. There is a close connection between the Spirit and the words of the one who has been sent. Water and Spirit function together to bring new life. The Spirit is breathed into God's people by means of the spoken word and they live. Thus, in the language of the Spirit, a further connection between Ezekiel and John is suggested.

3.7 *Signs*

According to Riga: "Perhaps no single word can give such a profound insight into the whole theology of the Fourth Gospel as the word σημεῖον."¹⁴³ Whether or not all agree with his assessment, it would be difficult to argue that σημεῖον was unimportant to John. Barrett says: "This is one of the most characteristic and important words of the gospel."¹⁴⁴ Although John uses σημεῖον only 17 times in the Gospel it is clear that he attaches great significance to the term as he relates signs to the purpose of his Gospel:

Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name (20:30–31).

Signs in the Fourth Gospel refer to the miraculous works of Jesus.¹⁴⁵ It appears that the first major section of the Gospel, the Book of Signs,¹⁴⁶ is built around seven signs with accompanying discourses.¹⁴⁷ Two signs are enumerated by

¹⁴³ Peter Riga, "Signs of Glory: The Use of 'Semeion' in St. John's Gospel," *Int* 17 (1963), 402.

¹⁴⁴ Barrett, *John*, 75.

¹⁴⁵ William David Dennison, "Miracles as 'Signs,' Their Significance for Apologetics," *BibThBul* 6 (1976), 191; Brown, *John*, 528; Morris, *John*, 686; Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 516; and Smalley, *John*, 86, all agree that "sign" is used for the miraculous. Hunter, *John*, 29, simply states: "John's word for miracle is 'sign.'" Riga, "Signs of Glory," 407, is one of the few to deny that *semeion* necessarily refers to an extraordinary miracle and he includes the cleansing of the temple as a sign. Our investigation concurs with the majority over Riga.

¹⁴⁶ So designated by Dodd, *Interpretation*, 289; and followed by Brown, *John*, xi; Smalley, *John*, 86, and Burge, *John*, 76.

¹⁴⁷ Schnackenburg says "it has long been customary to count seven," *John*, vol. 1, 516. Bultmann popularized the theory that a "signs source" was employed by the Evangelist to formulate the Gospel, *John*, 113. His student Robert T. Fortna further developed the theory in *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel*

the Evangelist so that the reader does not miss their presence (2:11 and 4:54). But there is no agreement over how to account for the other five.¹⁴⁸ There are several possibilities: the raising of the man at the pool of Bethesda (5:1–9), the feeding of the 5,000 (6:1–14), walking on water (6:15–21), the healing of the blind man (9:1–7), the raising of Lazarus (11:1–44), the resurrection (20:1–10), and the great catch of fish (21:6–11).¹⁴⁹ Through these signs men should be able to see clearly who Jesus is. Signs can indeed reveal the glory of Jesus to those who follow him (2:11). People are said to have believed in his name as a result of seeing his signs (2:23). Nicodemus knows that God is with Jesus because of the signs that he does (3:2). Even the blind man could deduce truth about the character of Jesus based on the sign he had experienced (9:16). However, sometimes signs merely attract a crowd. A crowd of people experienced the miracle of Jesus multiplying the loaves by the sea, but the majority of them failed to “see” the sign, that is, to comprehend what it represented about the identity and origin of Jesus (6:26). A person must see more than the act itself, one must come to see what it “signifies” about Jesus. Signs point to the character and mighty power of God at work through the person and ministry of His Son.¹⁵⁰

It is interesting that John never uses *δύναμις*, the favorite Synoptic term for miracle.¹⁵¹ On the other hand, he often uses the term *ἔργον*, work or deed, almost synonymously with *σημεῖον* (7:3, 31; 9:3–4, 16; 10:25, 32, 37–38, 41; 12:37;

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), and *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor. From Narrative Source to Present Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988). However, as Peterson, 71–77, describes, scholars debate the number of signs (6 to 8) in both Ezekiel and John.

148 Dodd, *Interpretation*, 289ff, finds seven in the Book of Signs, chapters 2–11. Smalley, *John*, 86–87, omits Jesus’ walking on water in chapter 6 but includes the great catch of fish in chapter 21. Douglas K. Clark, “Signs in Wisdom and John,” *CBQ* 45 (1983), 201–209, omits the walking on water and includes the resurrection as the seventh sign. Barrett denies that the resurrection could be counted as a sign “because it is not merely a token of something other than itself; this event is the thing which it signifies,” *John*, 78. To further complicate matters, John refers to Jesus’ signs, plural, in 2:23 and 3:2 prior to the “second” sign in 4:54. Obviously, the verdict is still out on the identity of the seven signs.

149 Riga, “Signs of Glory,” 407, would include the cleansing of the temple as a sign but does not limit himself to seven in the Fourth Gospel. The cleansing of the temple certainly has the character of a symbolic action intended to reveal the identity and mission of Jesus. The people even ask, “What *sign* do you show us that you do these things?” Later, in 2:23, “signs” which Jesus has done are mentioned, and it is possible that the cleansing could be included in this reference. The problem with accepting this pericope as a sign is that the healing of the nobleman’s son (4:46–54) is specifically referred to as the second sign. It seems best to regard only the miraculous among the special signs in the Fourth Gospel.

150 Barrett, *John*, 76.

151 Morris, *John*, 684.

15:24).¹⁵² The works of Jesus, as well as the signs, bear witness to Jesus as the envoy of God (5:36; 10:25, 37–38; 14:11; 15:24).¹⁵³ But while it can be said that the disciples will do greater works than Jesus (14:12), nowhere is there a mention of them performing signs. Working signs appears to be the function of Jesus alone.

Signs are also to be found in Ezekiel, although the language is varied and the usage less frequent. The LXX only uses σημεῖον six times; three times for the Hebrew *oth* (4:3; 20:12, 20), twice for *tav* (9:4, 6), and once for *tsiyun* (39:15). The Greek τέρας, a sign or wonder, is used for the Hebrew *mopheth* (12:6, 11; 24:24, 27).¹⁵⁴ Ezekiel is called upon by God to perform certain symbolic acts which are signs to God's people (4:3; 12:6). When the act itself is in focus, σημεῖον / *oth* is used, and when Ezekiel is the focus of the sign, τέρας / *tsiyun* is used. "Sign" can be used to refer to the Sabbaths (20:12, 20) as well as to Ezekiel himself. God gave signs through Ezekiel primarily so that His people "will know that I am the Lord" (12:6–15; 14:8; 20:12–20; 24:24–27).

While the terminology of John and Ezekiel has similarities, the way that they employ the language is somewhat different. Jesus performs signs of a miraculous nature while Ezekiel's signs are non-miraculous. The signs of Jesus reveal his own glory while Ezekiel performs signs (and is a sign) that point beyond himself to what God is doing in the world. People are not signs in the Gospel, nor do they receive a sign (a mark in Ezek 9:4, 6) to identify them as belonging to God. Signs in both John and Ezekiel are given to reveal, but that is the nature of signs, and any connection beyond that basic function between the two writers cannot be substantiated based on vocabulary study alone.¹⁵⁵

152 When the Johannine Jesus refers to what John calls σημεῖον he consistently uses the word ἔργον; "σημεῖον," TDNT 7:248.

153 Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 519.

154 This word is used once in John 4:48 in a negative context: "Unless you see signs and wonders (τέρατα) you will not believe."

155 However, Peterson has argued persuasively (in our opinion), that the connection between the signs of Ezekiel and John is much stronger than is obvious from vocabulary comparisons alone. First, the fact that there are similar numbers of signs (6 to 8) in both could be significant. Second, and more importantly, Peterson, 71, notes that both Ezekiel and Jesus "used signs as a means of authenticating their message and themselves as spokesmen for God." Given the facts that John shows great familiarity with Ezekiel's message and that both Ezekiel and Jesus (in John) perform their signs in the first half of their books, Peterson demonstrates the likelihood that John was deliberately alluding to Ezekiel in his use of signs. See the entire chapter, "John's Use of Signs and Ezekiel's Sign Acts," 65–98, for his excellent discussion of signs.

4 Conclusions

Comparing the theological vocabularies of John and Ezekiel shows signs of promise in terms of establishing contact between the two books, but not without difficulty. Certain key words of John's are missing from Ezekiel: Father (as it relates to God), believe, world (in regard to the world of men), and witness. Some other words are present, but used with quite different connotations: love, light, bread, door, way, true/truth, witness, judgment, and sign. These are noteworthy omissions and variations. They certainly point to the fact that Ezekiel was not the only tributary feeding into the river of John's theological heritage. Other traditions, influences, and sources took John into streams of thought that were either foreign to Ezekiel or minimal in his thinking.

On the other hand, some words in John's vocabulary bear striking resemblance to language used by Ezekiel: know, send, hear, shepherd, word, and water. Groups of words are found closely related to one another in both the Gospel and Ezekiel: life, water, and spirit; know and I am; send, word, and hear. And some themes are of great importance to both authors: knowing God, obeying God's word, beholding God's glory, and facing God's judgment. Some images can be found in both works: a vine representing God's people, men being raised to life, a temple that is destroyed and later rebuilt to display God's glory, water that gives life, and a new life brought about by water and spirit.

It would appear that John and Ezekiel share much in common beyond mere coincidence. Ezekiel may not have been the dominant figure in the background to the Fourth Gospel, but there is enough evidence in their shared vocabulary to suggest that he could have been an important influence on John's presentation of the Gospel. Areas of possible contact have been suggested. Shards of thought have been found in the Fourth Gospel that resemble Ezekielian pottery and these may reveal a close relationship between the two writers. Like the archaeologist who has dug a test plot and discovered evidence that warrants further excavation, the study of the theological vocabularies of John and Ezekiel has uncovered evidence that demands more extensive investigation.¹⁵⁶

Therefore, the discussion now turns from the study of simple word usage to observe the employment of those words in broader images and motifs within the Gospel. The next two chapters will seek to demonstrate primary and secondary points of contact between John and Ezekiel. The vocabulary study of this chapter will be kept in mind.

¹⁵⁶ Or, to change the metaphor, the discovery of traces of Ezekiel in the "core" samples of John's vocabulary merits a search for major deposits of Ezekielian ore in the strata of John's Gospel.

Primary Points of Contact

In the previous chapter, several points of contact between the theological vocabularies of the Fourth Gospel and Ezekiel were suggested. Some of the most promising indications were in regard to the words knowing, hearing, sent, water, spirit, life, “I am,” shepherd, resurrection, vine, word, glory and Temple. In addition to these, numerous intertextual relations between John and Ezekiel have been noted by various authors which imply further points of contact.¹

What follows in this chapter is a discussion of those points of contact which are believed to reveal a close intertextual connection with the Book of Ezekiel, and which appear to have had a marked influence on John’s presentation of Jesus. The arrangement is primarily in accordance with their order of appearance in the Gospel, but the complexity and inter-relatedness of themes in John’s Gospel do not allow for a tidy, balanced presentation.² As a result, the first point of contact discussed, The New Temple, is quite lengthy due to the broad development of the theme in the Gospel. Others points, though perhaps related to the Temple theme, are discussed separately and in less detail.

1 The New Temple

It is difficult to over-emphasize the importance of the new Temple in the Fourth Gospel.³ At first glance, it might be regarded as insignificant. Only once

1 References are scattered throughout the literature on the Fourth Gospel that point to texts in Ezekiel as providing the background to themes and images in the Gospel. Examples include: Bruce Vawter, “Ezekiel and John,” *CBQ* 26 (1964), 450–458, in regard to the images of Son of Man and Paraclete; Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downer’s Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1981), 193, on “to die in one’s sins” (John 8:21); and J. A. Emerton, “The Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes in John XXI.II,” *JTS* 9 (1958), 86–88, with reference to the great catch of fish.

2 For example, the image of “living water” is a major development of the new Temple theme, but it also deserves separate treatment as an important Johannine theme in its own right. Therefore, in this chapter it will be considered briefly under the new Temple and then as a separate heading.

3 Or its importance for Judaism in the first century. It was the center of worship and celebration. It represented the place of the presence of God, and the Rabbis spoke of the Shekinah as the dwelling of God, pre-eminently in the Temple; Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies*

is the subject of a new Temple specifically expressed, namely, in 2:19 where Jesus says: “Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up.” However, although John sets forth the idea of a new Temple only in 2:19, there are numerous contexts in which he develops the idea that Jesus functions as the place where men encounter the presence and glory of God, or where other functions of the Temple are taken up in the person and ministry of Jesus.⁴ So even in contexts where the term Temple is not employed the image of Jesus as the Temple remains.⁵ It is part of a larger movement on John’s part to show that Jesus is the fulfillment of the eternal purposes of God and the fulfillment of the Jewish religion.⁶ As such it is an important motif of the Gospel. A number of Johannine themes combine with it to bring out its significance for understanding the person and ministry of Jesus.

1.1 *The Replacement, or Embodiment, of Judaism?*

Several commentators have observed a *replacement* motif running through the first chapters of John’s Gospel.⁷ To them, John appears to be making a conscious effort to show that Jesus is the replacement of Judaism. However, with Hays,⁸ we prefer the terminology that Jesus *embodies* Judaism, instead of replacing it. God’s glory revealed in the Tabernacle of Exodus is now revealed in the Word (1:14). The law was given through Moses, but grace and truth came to be through Jesus Christ (1:17). The waterpots of Jewish purification could not provide the new wine that Jesus brings (2:1–11). Jewish heritage is insufficient

in *The Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*, (NovTSup 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 205–206.

- 4 W. D. Davies discusses a number of “holy places” in the Gospel (Bethel, Mt. Gerizim, Bethzatha, and the Pool of Siloam), and refers to them as having been replaced with, or transcended by, Jesus as the new Temple, in *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 288–335. Aileen Guilding discusses the themes of revelation (glory), purification, and worship as found in chapters 1–4 of John’s Gospel in a 41–page chapter entitled “The New Temple”; *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), 171–211.
- 5 Gaston brings this out in a section entitled “Jesus as the Temple in the Fourth Gospel,” *No Stone*, 205–213. R. J. McKelvey also traces this development in *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 75–84.
- 6 C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2nd. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 195.
- 7 See Brown, *John*, 1:104; Guilding, *Fourth Gospel*, 171; Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 288–335; Barrett, *John*, 196; and D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty*, 133.
- 8 See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 429 n.32, where he states, “Often John is understood to present Jesus as the *replacement* of the temple, as well as the Jewish feasts, institutions, and even the entire sacrificial system.... But the terms *assume* and *transform*, even *embody*, are more apt to John’s incarnational theology and his figural reading of Scripture that points to that which is brought to fruition in Jesus.”

for entrance into the kingdom of God—new life comes through faith in Jesus (3:1–16). Worship is no longer to be restricted to Jerusalem (or Mt. Gerizim), but to take place in spirit and in truth by means of the gift which only Jesus can give (4:7–26). He displaces the Jewish feasts and appropriates their cardinal symbols (2:13, 23; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2, 37; etc.).⁹ Jesus is the embodiment of the Jewish “holy places” where men encounter God and experience His blessing—Bethel (1:51), the cistern of Jacob in Samaria and Mt. Gerizim (4:13–14; 21–23), Bethzatha (5:1–9), and the Pool of Siloam (9:7 in light of 3:17, 34; 5:36, 38).¹⁰ Jesus is even the True Vine (15:1), a term previously applied to the nation Israel,¹¹ but in the Fourth Gospel to Jesus alone.

Perhaps the most profound statement of embodiment language found in the Gospel is found in chapter 2:19–21, where Jesus says: “Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up,” and John explains: “But he spoke of the temple of his body.”¹² The Temple, with its cycles of feasts, was at the center of Jewish cultic life. To go up to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles (John 7:1–14) was to go *to the Temple*. It was understood within Israel to represent the place of God’s presence, the place where the atonement of sin was effected, and it was perceived as the sign of the gracious election of God.¹³ The Jewish authorities, when discussing what to do about Jesus, showed concern for the Temple as the embodiment of the nation and chose to eliminate Jesus rather than risk the destruction of “our holy place and our nation” (John 11:48). In fact, it may not be hyperbolic to say that nothing could have expressed the idea of the embodiment of Judaism more clearly than the claim that Jesus’ body is the Temple. Hays concludes:

If we attend to the way that Scripture actually functions in John, we will see that the identity of Jesus is deeply embedded in Israel’s texts and traditions—especially the traditions centered on the Temple and Israel’s annual feasts. This is the world in which John’s imagination is immersed; it is impossible to understand John’s Jesus apart from the story of Israel and the liturgical festivals and symbols that recall and re-present that story. It is not accurate, then, to say that Jesus nullifies or replaces Israel’s Torah and Israel’s worship life. Rather, he *assumes* and *transforms* them.¹⁴

9 So Carson, *Divine Sovereignty*, 133; and Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 296.

10 Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 296–317.

11 Ps 80, Isa 5, Hosea 10, and Ezek 15, 19.

12 Thus, for the Johannine circle, “the Temple had been done away with by the person of the Logos,” according to Oscar Cullmann, *The Johannine Circle*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), 92.

13 Gaston, *No Stone*, 205.

14 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 287–88.

1.2 *Jewish Expectations*

John's "Jesus-as-Temple" motif can be understood in light of an apocalyptic expectation of a new Temple.¹⁵ Bultmann's opinion is typical when he asserts that: "Long before the destruction of Herod's Temple in AD 70 the hope was current that a new and more glorious Temple would arise in the Messianic Age."¹⁶ Gaston has questioned whether this assumption has ever been tested and tries to make a case for the expectation being one of a new Zion (with emphasis on the city of Jerusalem) rather than a new Temple.¹⁷ However, despite Gaston's objection, it is difficult to ignore the emphasis that Ezekiel places on the new Temple in chapters 40–48.¹⁸ In these chapters the focus is not on a description of the new Jerusalem (as required by Gaston's hypothesis), but Ezekiel provides detailed information about *the new Temple*—its layout, dimensions, parts, and furnishings.¹⁹ Brown affirms the idea of a hope for a messianic rebuilding of the Temple and believes that Jesus' statement would have been understandable as such to those who knew the background in Ezek 40–48 and Tobit 13:10–12; 15:5–7.²⁰ Even Gaston is forced to admit:

After the building of the second Temple, the expectation that the new Jerusalem would contain a Temple became more general. It may very well be the contrast between the magnificent predictions of Ezekiel and the actual rebuilt Temple that led to the hope of a new Temple in the future.²¹

¹⁵ Ibid., 104. Here Gaston provides an impressive list of commentators who attest to an apocalyptic hope for a new Temple by the time of the destruction of the Temple, even though he tries to argue otherwise.

¹⁶ Rudolph Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), 120. Bultmann reaffirms this opinion in *The Gospel of John*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and K. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 126, and in appeals to Bousset and Strack-Billerbeck for support.

¹⁷ Gaston, *No Stone*, 102–233.

¹⁸ Ezekiel's vision and description of the new Temple in these chapters form one of the three major divisions of the book in the commentary of G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (1CC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), xvii.

¹⁹ Ralph W. Klein, *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 171.

²⁰ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Anchor Bible, vol. 29 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966), 122–123. Rudolph Schnackenburg agrees and includes Hag. 2:7ff, Zech. 2:5–9, and Ecclesiasticus 36:18f in a list of passages that support such a hope; *The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 1, trans. Kevin Smyth (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1990), 350.

²¹ Gaston, *No Stone*, 109.

It would appear, then, that Jesus' claim to rebuild the Temple (with John's explanation that the Temple is to be equated with Jesus' body) is best understood in light of an eschatological expectation that was inspired, in a large measure, by the vision of Ezekiel.²² If this is true, then John can be understood as purposefully presenting Jesus as the fulfillment of that hope.²³

1.3 *Ezekiel's New Temple*

The constraints of this study make it impossible to go into great detail articulating the scope and significance of Ezekiel's vision of the new Temple in chapters 40–48.²⁴ What does need to be provided is a context for the vision, and an outline of the various themes that accompany the image of the new Temple in Ezekiel. Once this is done, a comparison with what is found in John's Gospel can be conducted and parallels evaluated.

Ezekiel was a hereditary member of the Temple priesthood taken from Jerusalem to Babylon during the first deportation of Jews following the surrender of Jerusalem in 597 BC.²⁵ It is not certain that he had ever actually served in the Temple,²⁶ but this background accounts for his interest in the Temple, his knowledge about its ordinances, and the similarities between his writing and the priestly traditions of the Old Testament.²⁷ Trained to serve in the Temple, Ezekiel's deportation from Jerusalem prevented him from taking up his priestly office²⁸ and dashed all natural hopes.²⁹ While living among the exiles in Babylon, he was called to be a prophet during a theophanic vision.³⁰

22 Brown, *John*, 122–123. Brown also refers to copies found at Qumran of an Aramaic Description of the New Jerusalem (5Q15) which include a description of an ideal Temple. According to Brown, the section on the Temple is based upon Ezekiel; 122. This would contradict Gaston's claim that there is no indication in the Qumran materials of a hope for a new Temple; *No Stone*, 126.

23 John Marsh, *Saint John* (Westminster Pelican Commentaries; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 109.

24 An excellent description and explanation is provided by Jon Douglas Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48* (HSM 10; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976).

25 Walter Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, Old Testament Library, trans. Cosslett Quin (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970), 1–3, 53.

26 A. B. Davidson, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1906), xvii.

27 Klein, *Ezekiel*, 5.

28 Daniel I. Block (*The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24* [NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997], 8) suggests that Ezekiel “was probably one of the few in line for the priestly ministry who took the calling seriously.”

29 Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 3.

30 John T. Bunn, “Ezekiel,” (Broadman Bible Commentary 6; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1971), 238–241.

The twin strains of priest and prophet were woven into his character and show their influence in his ministry.³¹

There are three “vision” scenes in Ezekiel that are particularly pertinent to the study at hand. Three times in Ezekiel he claims to have “visions of God,” 1:1, 8:3, and 40:2. In each of these dramatic scenes the glory of God plays an important role and ties all three together.³² Each has special meaning in reference to the Temple.

In the first vision (Ezek 1:1–3:15), Ezekiel is at the river Chebar when “the heavens were opened and I saw visions of God” (1:1). A major emphasis in this passage is the glory of God on His throne (1:28). Ezekiel uses a host of words to describe the brilliance of his vision—brightness, flashing, gleaming, sparkled like burnished bronze, burning coals of fire, torches, the fire was bright, flashes of lightning, gleaming of chrysolite, shining like crystal, appearance of sapphire, gleaming bronze, fire, and the appearance of a (rain)bow. Growing out of this vision of God and His glory on the throne was Ezekiel’s call to ministry (2:1–3:11). The result of such an experience was for Ezekiel to sit down “overwhelmed” for seven days (3:15). From this encounter Ezekiel, and the people through him, came to understand that “God was not restricted to the Temple in Jerusalem, but could make His presence felt and His voice heard in distant Babylon.”³³

In the second scene, Ezekiel is carried “in visions of God” to Jerusalem where he encounters “the glory of the God of Israel ... like the vision that I saw in the plain” (8:4). There he is led to inspect the Temple. At the gate was “the seat of the image of jealousy which provokes to jealousy” (8:3). The exact nature of this image is difficult to identify,³⁴ but it is obvious that God is not pleased with it as He refers to the “great abominations that the house of Israel are committing here” that serve to drive Him far from the sanctuary (8:6). Further inside the Temple the scenes of corruption continue—Ezekiel is told to dig through a wall so as to view an inner room where 70 elders are worshipping in the midst of abominable pictures on every wall³⁵ (8:10–12), women are seen weeping for

31 Cooke, *Ezekiel*, xxvii.

32 Ezekiel ties the three together himself in 43:1–3, where he says that “the vision I saw was like the vision which I had seen when he came to destroy the city, and like the vision which I had seen by the river Chebar” (8:13 and 1:11).

33 James C. Turro, *The Book of Ezekiel* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1967), 14.

34 Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 122; Bruce Vawter and Leslie J. Hoppe, *A New Heart. A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (1TC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 65; admit to the ambiguity and agree that it probably refers to an image of Asherah, the queen of heaven.

35 According to Eichrodt, these were following Egyptian prototypes and indicate a foreign cult practiced in secret; *Ezekiel*, 124.

Tammuz (8:14),³⁶ men are discovered worshipping the sun (8:16), and “putting the branch to the nose” (8:17).³⁷ As a result of these abominations, God pronounces judgment (8:18) and calls for executioners to go through the city, beginning from the Temple, destroying the people (9:1–11). Only those who sigh and groan for the abominations of the city are to be spared (9:4–6).

There is an important theme throughout these chapters (8–11) tracing the location of the glory of God—first He is at the gateway of the inner court (8:3),³⁸ then at the threshold of the house (9:3), later He is over the cherubim (10:18) at the door of the east gate of the house of the Lord (10:19), and finally His glory moves out of the midst of the city entirely and stands on the mountain to the east of the city (11:23). What Ezekiel witnesses is the departure of God’s manifest presence, first from the Temple, and eventually from the city of Jerusalem. It is a picture of God’s being driven away by the iniquity of the people (8:6). His glory (presence) has been removed from the Temple and, therefore, from His people.

In the third vision (40–48) Ezekiel is carried “in visions of God” to a high mountain and is given a guide to assist him in the inspection of God’s new Temple (40:1–43:1). Ezekiel witnesses the return of the glory of God³⁹ to fill the new Temple (43:2–5) and hears a voice speaking to him from the Temple saying: “Son of man, this is the place of my throne and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the people of Israel for ever” (43:7).⁴⁰ A section follows (43:18–46:24) in which Ezekiel is instructed as to the ordinances and sacrifices that are to be carried out in the Temple.⁴¹ Included are instructions for cleansing the altar (43:18–27) and for teaching the people in

36 One of the most popular deities of Mesopotamia; *ibid.*, 126.

37 An obscure reference possibly related to “breaking wind” in the face of God; Klein, *Ezekiel*, 56–57.

38 Vawter observes: “It is important to note that the glory of the Lord had already departed the inner precincts of the Temple and is now, as it were, poised to quit Jerusalem altogether;” *A New Heart*, 65.

39 Walter Zimmerli reflects: “He sees the entrance of Yahweh’s majesty into this new sanctuary, an entrance that supersedes the horrible separation of God from Israel’s sanctuary ... in the vision of chapters 8–11,” in *I Am Yahweh*, trans. Douglas W. Scott, ed. Walter Brueggemann (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 114.

40 Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 464, brings out the significance: “The favour which had been withdrawn is now restored. The Sovereign Lord, who has His throne above the Cherubim in heaven, henceforth makes the Temple His throne and footstool on earth.”

41 The section in 43:6–46:24 is important to Ezekiel but almost unfortunate for the reader because it “tends to obscure the logic of the narrative according to which the water flowing from inside the Temple (47:1–12) is the direct consequence of the return of the *kabod* to the inner sanctuary (43:1–5);” Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel* (Interpretation Series; Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990), 230.

regard to holy and common, clean and unclean (44:23). Then he is taken to the door of the Temple where he witnesses a river flowing from the threshold of the Temple (47:1). The river flows, deeper and deeper, out to the Arabah and into the Dead Sea bringing life wherever it goes (47:2–9). Fishermen spread their nets by the water (47:10), and trees spring up along the banks which will provide fruit for food and leaves for healing “because the water for them flows from the sanctuary” (47:12). The vision on the mountain includes the division of the land for the twelve tribes of Israel and designates gates for each one in the city (47:21–48:34). Even the aliens are provided an inheritance (47:22–23). The vision concludes with the affirmation that the name of the city will be “The Lord is there” (48:35). The theme of God’s presence with His people, then, is a central motif in chapters 40–48.⁴² In fact, it is a key idea for the entire prophecy of Ezekiel. Niditch brings this out in a brief summary of Ezekiel’s prophecy:

Ezekiel begins with a vision of the heavenly throne and closes with a vision of the Temple, God’s earthly dwelling; it opens with a message about God’s departure from the old Temple and closes with the image of his glory’s returning to the new one.⁴³

But for Ezekiel, this vision is yet to be reality, it awaits the coming of the new Temple of God.

Several themes come to the surface in these and related passages. The glory and presence of the Lord, of course, are prevalent. There are also themes of corruption and destruction, and cleansing and renewal, related to the Temple (sanctuary) and God’s glory (presence) in it. Chapters 8–11 show that the Temple was corrupted by the abominable behavior of the people. Yahweh was rejected for other gods and was driven from the Temple as a consequence of this corruption (8:6). The result is destruction—the executioners come to destroy in Ezekiel’s vision (9:1–11) and the Babylonians will come in 587 BC to destroy the Temple and decimate the people.⁴⁴ But God has plans for His people beyond 587 BC. He intends to cleanse and renew His people (36:22–36) and dwell with them again:

⁴² Klein, *Ezekiel*, 188.

⁴³ Susan Niditch, “Ezek 40–48 in a Visionary Context,” *CBQ* 48 (1986), 215.

⁴⁴ Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 6.

I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will bless them and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My dwelling place shall be with them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Then the nations will know that I the Lord sanctify Israel when my sanctuary is in the midst of them for evermore (37:26–28).

Another important image to note is that of the water that flows from the Temple. Elsewhere water is used by God for cleansing: “I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you” (36:25); but the water flowing from the new Temple has a more profound significance. Wherever it flows it brings life and healing (47:2–10). It is noteworthy that all of these themes will re-appear in John’s Gospel.

1.4 *Jesus as the New Temple*

As has been indicated above, the motif of the new Temple finds expression in various contexts of the Fourth Gospel even when the term Temple is not employed. A number of passages and themes are related to the Temple motif and can be interpreted in light of it.⁴⁵ Some of these occur prior to John’s identification of Jesus as the new Temple in 2:19–22 and seem to anticipate that revelation. Those that follow look back to the identification of Jesus as the Temple both to develop the motif and to be interpreted by it.⁴⁶

The first passage to anticipate Jesus as the new Temple is found in the Prologue (1:14) where John introduces Jesus, the incarnate Word, as the place where God’s glory is manifest: “And the Word [λόγος] became flesh and dwelt⁴⁷ among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father.” Gaston suggests that the Aramaic word for God’s presence, שכִּינָה (Shekinah), was in the mind of the translators of the LXX when they chose a word with the same radicals *s-k-n* to designate God’s dwelling:

45 An example of this is provided by Guiding where she deals with the themes of revelation (glory), purification, and worship in chapters 1–4 of the Fourth Gospel under the heading “The New Temple” even though the Temple is only mentioned specifically in these chapters at 2:13–22; *Fourth Gospel*, 171–211.

46 For example, commenting on 7:37–39 where rivers of living water are said to flow, Gaston states that “the identification of Jesus with the Temple is clearly intended;” *No Stone*, 211; and Brown sees in Jesus’ discourse with the Samaritan woman an expansion of the Temple theme in 2:13–22, *John*, 181.

47 σκηνώω: to pitch one’s tent (*TDNT* 7:368).

σκαηνόω.⁴⁸ Further, Sheri Kling observes that σκαηνόω in John 1:14 calls to mind Hebrew Bible God's dwelling in a σκαηνή (skene)⁴⁹ among the Israelites (cf. Exod. 33:9; and 40:34).⁵⁰ For Greek-speaking Jews and other readers of the LXX, the term σκαηνή would evoke the Tabernacle where God met with Israel before the Temple was built.

An obvious background for 1:14, then, is to be found in the Exodus wilderness traditions where the כְּבוֹד (chabod)⁵¹ of God dwelt with the people in the Tabernacle (Exodus 39:33ff.; Deut 3:23ff.).⁵² But while it seems certain that this reference looked back to the glory of God in the Exodus it is also possible for it to look forward to the glory of God present in the establishment of a new Temple. Meagher explains:

... the choice of the verb *skenoun* in John 1:14 is most easily explained if one assumes a deliberate allusion to the Tabernacle or to the Temple. The result of such an allusion is to imply the establishment of a new Temple where the Divine Word pitches his tent, or "tabernacles."⁵³

48 Gaston, *No Stone*, 209. See also Grant R. Osborne, *Revelation* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002), 328–29.

49 σκαηνή: tent, tabernacle (TDNT 7:370).

50 Sheri D. Kling, "Wisdom Became Flesh: An Analysis of the Prologue to the Gospel of John," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 40.3 (2013): 179–87. This was also noted by Peterson, 45. See also D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 126.

51 כְּבוֹד (chabod): glory, honor, dignity (TDOT 7.22–37). Pieter De Vries (*The Kabod of YHWH in the Old Testament: With Particular Reference to the Book of Ezekiel* [Studia Semitica Neerlandica 65; Leiden: Brill, 2015], 233 notes, "There are only three passages in Ezek with occurrences of כְּבוֹד (all of the mentions refer to YHWH with a single exception at 39:21): Chaps 1–3, Chaps. 8–11 and Chaps. 40–48. In these three passages, what is meant by the word is the כְּבוֹד of YHWH as a manifestation of Himself, as a hypostasis. The passages in question all have the character of a vision or perhaps even of a true theophany. This highlights the special character, within Ezekiel, of these parts of the book. The three parts have threefold introductions: first there is a date, then we read of the hand of Yhwh (יְהוָה) coming upon the prophet, and then the expression מְרָאוֹת אֱלֹהִים is used. This threefold introduction is found only in those three instances in Ezekiel. This underscores the remarkable nature of the כְּבוֹד of YHWH in Ezekiel."

52 Edwin C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. Francis N. Davey (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1947), 147–148.

53 John C. Meagher, "John 1:14 and the New Temple," *JBL* 88 (1969), 57. Meagher also refers here to a tradition going back to Origen and Chrysostom which associates this verse with the Temple. It is curious that, in Revelation 15:5, Temple and Tabernacle are combined into one as "the Temple of the tent of witness." The Greek of Rev 15:5 is ὁ ναὸς τῆς σκαηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου.

Brown also makes the connection between the Tabernacle and the Temple while commenting on 1:14 as he recalls the promise of God in Ezekiel to dwell among His people:

In the ideal Temple described by Ezekiel (xliiii 7) God will make His dwelling in the midst of His people forever, or as the LXX has it: “*My name* shall dwell in the midst of the house of Israel forever.” (The latter is interesting in view of the Johannine interest in *the name*.) When the Prologue proclaims that the Word made his dwelling among men, we are being told that the flesh of Jesus Christ is the new localization of God’s presence on earth, and that Jesus is the replacement of the ancient Tabernacle. The Gospel will present Jesus as the replacement of the Temple (ii 19–22), which is a variation of the same theme.⁵⁴

The emphasis on the λόγος in the Prologue would seem to support this connection even further due to the fact that in Sirach 24:8–10 wisdom dwells in the Temple.⁵⁵ Therefore, if Dodd⁵⁶ and Brown⁵⁷ are correct in understanding the λόγος of the Prologue in terms of the wisdom tradition of Judaism, then in 1:14 John is found combining the concepts of wisdom, Shekinah, and glory to show that he sees in Jesus the presence of God previously associated with the Temple.⁵⁸ It appears that in the Prologue to John’s Gospel the themes of God’s glory, God’s dwelling with His people, and the new Temple are purposefully intertwined.

The connection of Jesus with the Temple is further developed in 1:51 where he says to Nathaniel: “Truly, truly, I say to you, you will see heaven opened,⁵⁹ and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.”⁶⁰ The generally recognized background for this statement is Gen 28:10–17 where

54 Brown, *John*, 33.

55 Gaston, *No Stone*, 209.

56 C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 263–285.

57 Brown, *John*, i–xii.

58 Gaston, *No Stone*, 209; and McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 76.

59 The “open heaven” motif (also in Matthew 3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:21; Acts 7:56; 10:11; Revelation 19:11) is found in the Old Testament only in Ezek 1:1 where Ezekiel has his vision of the glory of God. Gen 7:11, Isa 24:18 and Mal 3:10 have the *window* of heaven open, and Ps 78:23 provides a picture of the *door* of heaven open, but only Ezekiel has an open heaven. One other possibility pointed out by Schnackenburg is in Isa 63:19 (64:1 in the RSV) where the people cry out for the heavens to be rent so that God will come down; *John*, vol. 1, 321.

60 McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 77.

Jacob has his dream of angels on a ladder stretched from earth to heaven, with the Lord speaking to him from above it.⁶¹ Jacob's conclusion was that the place was "the house of God (Bethel), and ... the gate of heaven" (Gen 28:17). Over time, Jewish tradition came to associate the "house of God" with the Temple.⁶² So for John, Jesus assumes the role of the holy place, Bethel,⁶³ and 1:51 provides further evidence that Jesus has embodied "the place where heaven and earth meet, the place of the presence of God, the Temple."⁶⁴

It is not until 2:21 that John makes clear the identification of Jesus as the new Temple, even though this has been anticipated from chapter 1. The context has Jesus cleansing the Temple of the traders who are conducting business there (2:13–22). Though the Johannine version of the cleansing of the Temple does not impugn the character of the traders with the claim that they make it a "den of robbers" (as in the synoptic accounts—Matthew 21:13; Mark 11:17; and Luke 19:46), it is clear that Jesus is offended by their actions.⁶⁵ Beasley-Murray explains:

The trade in the Temple was viewed as an act of desecration: "Stop making the house of my Father a house of trade." There is probably an allusion here to the final words of Zechariah's vision of the kingdom of God: "No trader shall again be seen in the house of the Lord of Hosts." Jesus is taking action to bring about the eschatological order wherein God will be glorified in his house and in the worship of his people.⁶⁶

The Father's house was being defiled and Jesus moved to cleanse it. The Jewish leaders who had watched Jesus cleanse the Temple demanded an explanation of the authority upon which he had acted (2:18).⁶⁷ To this Jesus replied: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." Jesus' enigmatic answer was immediately misunderstood.⁶⁸ The Jews related it to the physical

61 Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 296–297.

62 Ibid., 296. The rabbis identified the stone on which Jacob slept as the foundation-stone of the Temple in Jerusalem; so McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 77.

63 Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 297–298.

64 Gaston, *No Stone*, 210.

65 Leon Morris points out that Jesus' objection is not to their dishonesty, but to their presence and practice of trade in the Temple; *The Gospel According to John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 195.

66 G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco: Word, 1987), 39.

67 Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 348.

68 So Carson, *John*, 181. This is the first of a series of misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel. For a list and explanation of how these fit into the scheme of the Gospel see R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia:

building before them (2:20) while John clearly related the passage to Jesus' body (2:21). The riddle can be resolved by understanding the meaning to lie at two levels. Applied to Herod's Temple it can be understood as "an ironic call to carry on their behavior to its limit, which will end in the destruction of the Temple."⁶⁹ At another level "the destruction of the Temple is completed in the destruction of the body of Jesus, and the building of the new Temple takes place through the resurrection of Jesus."⁷⁰ Herod's Temple would indeed be destroyed in AD 70 and the Temple cultus comes to an end.⁷¹ But, for John, that Temple had already lost its significance to the person of Jesus, having been transformed by him as the meeting-point between God and man,⁷² and the ultimate fulfillment of the hope for a new eschatological Temple would be realized at the resurrection of Jesus.⁷³

The idea that the Temple in Jerusalem was no longer the place where worship was to take place is developed further in 4:19–26 in Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman.⁷⁴ In response to a question about the proper place for worship Jesus replies:

Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father.... But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for such the Father seeks to worship him, God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth (4:21–24).

Both Mt. Gerizim and Jerusalem, and the temples they contain, are embodied by Jesus.⁷⁵ Worship can no longer be limited to any special locality but is determined by whether or not it is conducted in "spirit and in truth." Such worship is facilitated by Jesus who is the source of the Spirit in whom alone worship in

Fortress Press, 1983), 152–165; or D. A. Carson, "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel," *TynBul* 13 (1982), 59–91.

69 Beasley-Murray, *John*, 40.

70 *Ibid.*, 41.

71 Ernst Haenchen, *John*, vol. 1, trans. Robert Funk (Hermeneia series; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 187.

72 Carson, *John*, 182.

73 It is noteworthy that Brown connects this expectation with Ezekiel's promise of a new Temple in chapters 40–46. As evidence that such an expectation existed at the time of Jesus, he points to a Qumran document (which he believes is based upon Ezekiel) that describes an ideal Temple in the New Jerusalem. See *John*, 122–123.

74 Brown comments: "In this scene John has revived and expanded themes treated earlier in the Gospel (Temple of 2:13–22; water and Spirit of Nicodemus discourse)." See *John*, 181.

75 Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 302.

“spirit and truth” is possible. That Jesus is the source of the Spirit is hinted at here in his offer of “living water” to the Samaritan woman. It becomes explicit in 7:37–39 where John equates the “living water” with the Spirit that believers will receive once Jesus is glorified.

The setting for 7:37–39 is the Feast of Tabernacles (7:2) and takes place in the Temple where Jesus has been teaching (7:14, 28). On the last day of the feast he proclaims: “If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink. He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, ‘Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water.’” An integral part of the feast was a daily libation of water taken from the pool of Siloam⁷⁶ in solemn procession and poured out in the Temple.⁷⁷ This practice was in keeping with rabbinic interpretations of Tabernacles which made special use of Isa 12:3 (“With joy you will draw water from the wells of salvation”) and Ezek 47:1–12 (where the rivers of water flow from the threshold of the Temple).⁷⁸ The rabbis also took Zech 13:1 (“On that day there shall be a fountain opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to cleanse them from sin and uncleanness”) and 14:8ff. (“On that day living waters shall flow out from Jerusalem ...”) to refer to the Feast of Tabernacles.⁷⁹ With such connotations the Feast encouraged an expectation of “the abundant gift of living water flowing from Jerusalem when the kingdom of God comes.”⁸⁰ It is in this unique setting that Jesus cries out and presents himself to the thirsty believer as the one who is the source of the living water. If the scripture referred by Jesus is to be found in Ezek 47 where water flows from Ezekiel’s Temple, as Daniélou believes,⁸¹ then 7:37–39 represents a further development of the Temple theme. McKelvey gives the significance:

... the altar, or more precisely the rock on which it rested, was said to mark the spot where the world’s thirst was quenched. Jesus’ claim to supply living water could not fail to challenge Jewish readers. It meant that the centre and source of the world’s life was no longer the temple of Jerusalem, but himself, the new temple.⁸²

76 The pool of Siloam is one of the holy places replaced by Jesus as the Temple according to Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 315.

77 Haenchen, *John*, vol. 2, trans. Robert Funk (Hermeneia series; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 17.

78 W. H. Cadman, *The Open Heaven*, ed. G. B. Caird (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 106.

79 Haenchen, *John*, vol. 2, 17.

80 Beasley-Murray, *John*, 114.

81 Jean Daniélou, “Jean VII, 37–39 et Ezechiel 47, 1–11,” in *Studia Evangelica*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), 158–163.

82 McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 81.

As the embodiment of the Temple (2:21), Jesus is also the source of “rivers of living water.”⁸³

One other passage deserves attention with regard to John’s development of Temple themes in the Fourth Gospel. It is the statement of Jesus’ departure from the Temple in 8:56–59. Davies observes:

Most commentators either ignore or pay scant attention to the reference to this departure from the Temple; it merely signifies, it is implied, that the activity of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles is over. Jesus had gone up to the Temple in 7:14, and now in 8:59, naturally, he leaves it.... But it is possible to give the narrative setting of these two chapters a special significance.⁸⁴

What Davies proposes is that the departure from the Temple in 8:59 marked a final rejection on the part of Jesus toward the Temple and its cult.⁸⁵ His line of argument is as follows. Jesus, the incarnate Word, goes to Jerusalem and makes an appeal to the people at the center of the nation, the Temple.⁸⁶ “He came to his own home⁸⁷ but his own people received him not” (1:11). Rather than a warm reception, tensions build until the Jews are ready to kill him (8:36). He reveals himself as “I am” (8:58)⁸⁸ and the Jews take up stones to kill him (8:59). The result is that Jesus departs the Temple never to return. Davies summarizes:

In 8:59 we find the implication that, for John, “I am” has departed from the Temple, that “holy space” is no longer the abode of the Divine Presence. The Shekinah is no longer *there*, but is now found wherever Christ is, because later (10:36 makes this probable, if not unmistakably clear) Christ himself is the Sanctified One, the altar and Temple, the locus of the Shekinah.⁸⁹

83 As has been noted, the image of “living water” in 4:10 and 7:38 easily stands alone as a primary point of contact with the Book of Ezekiel and will be given separate treatment below (pp. 85–89). It is included here because of its relationship to the larger motif of the new Temple.

84 Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 290.

85 Ibid., 289–296.

86 Davies draws from C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 351–352; *Gospel and Land*, 291.

87 Or “place”. The Greek has the neuter ἵδιᾱ here and masculine ἵδιῳι for people.

88 Davies is convinced from his study of rabbinic literature that the Divine Name, “I am,” probably played a prominent role in the liturgy of the Feast of Tabernacles, *Gospel and Land*, 295.

89 Ibid.

As for the objection that Jesus is in the Temple at 10:22, Davies reminds the reader that the text states that Jesus was “in the portico of Solomon,” which, for Davies, is not the Temple proper, but merely the boundary of the Temple. For Davies, Jesus walks on the fringes of the Temple during the Feast of Dedication knowing that its true hour of renewal is past; the real dedication of the Temple is that which he himself will accomplish.⁹⁰ Later, at Passover (11:56) the Pharisees will be in the Temple wondering if Jesus will come to the Feast. When he does come his rejection of the Temple is complete and Jesus avoids the Temple altogether.⁹¹

If Davies’ hypothesis is correct, then the presentation of Jesus as the new Temple reaches a climax in 8:59. Like God’s departure from the Temple in Jerusalem in Ezek 11:22–23, the glory of God (Jesus) departs the Temple in Jerusalem again in John 8:59. What awaits is the resurrection of a new Temple in the resurrection of the body of Jesus at his glorification.

1.5 *Parallels*

Several points of contact between John’s new Temple, Jesus, and the new Temple of Ezekiel have been noted in the discussion above. However, a review is appropriate in order to recall their significance. Both authors begin their work with an emphasis of God’s glory coming to encounter man (Ezek 1:1–28; John 1:14), a glory previously connected with the sanctuary in Jerusalem, but which is no longer bound to such geography (Ezek 8:4; John 4:21–24). Both include a reference to an open heaven (Ezek 1:1; John 1:51). In both works there is the problem of corruption in the Jerusalem Temple which calls for a “cleansing” (Ezek 8–11, especially 9:6; John 2:13–17) and a desire for true worshippers (Ezek 9:5, 11:17–21; John 4:23–24). In both instances, the Temple in Jerusalem is eventually rejected, abandoned by God (Ezek 11:22–23; John 8:59), and ultimately destroyed (587 BC and AD 70). The embodiment of the Temple in both cases is not to be another of the same kind, but something totally different (Ezek 40–48; John 2:21).⁹² Both new temples are manifestations of the glory of God (Ezek 43:1–5; John 1:14). From both temples flow rivers of living water

90 Ibid., 292–293.

91 Ibid. This is different from the Synoptics, where Jesus is found in the Temple on numerous occasions, but only during his final week. In John’s Gospel, it is the last of several visits.

92 It might be argued that Ezekiel foresaw a Temple similar to, though more glorious than, the Temple that he had grown up with in Jerusalem. While this is true in a measure, it cannot be denied that the Temple in his vision, with a river of life-giving water flowing from its threshold was something unlike anything he had ever encountered before. The nature of the new Temple in his vision was super-natural, regardless of how its description may have resembled a physical structure at some point in history.

that are symbolic of the outpouring of God's life-giving Spirit (Ezek 36:22–32, 47:1–12; John 7:37–39). The parallels are striking.

1.6 *Conclusions and Implications*

That John intended to portray Jesus as the embodiment of the Temple can be said to be established. This is the clear intention of John 2:21 and it has been the prevailing conclusion of a host of commentators.⁹³ Furthermore, the theme is not isolated to the second chapter of the Gospel, but finds expression throughout the Gospel and serves to tie a variety of themes together.⁹⁴ A comment by Schnackenburg on the further implications of John's explanation that Jesus' body is the Temple is illustrative of how commentators have observed an interconnection of themes in the Gospel:

This explanation makes Jesus the "place" where God is to be adored, the true "house of God" (cf. 1:51). With him and in him the time of the worship of God "in spirit and truth" (4:23) has dawned. His body is the source of the waters of life (19:34; so too 7:38, see *ad loc.*), his person is the vine through whose vital force the disciples can work and bear fruit (15:4–8).⁹⁵

For John, then, the new Temple theme plays a major role in his presentation of Jesus.

For Ezekiel, too, the theme of a new Temple has profound significance. Trained to serve in the Temple, his deportation from Jerusalem brought about a crisis in his life that only "visions of God" could resolve. The Temple that he longed to serve in would be destroyed. God had rejected it. But another Temple would appear, one with super-natural qualities, and the glory of God would dwell in the Temple in the midst of His renewed people forever. It was around this new Temple that Ezekiel was privileged to "see" in a vision, that God's program of restoration would revolve.⁹⁶

Certain questions emerge. Is the Fourth Gospel somewhat dependent upon Ezekiel in its presentation of Jesus as the new Temple? Does John intend to communicate Jesus as the fulfillment of Ezekiel's promise of a new

93 Including Barrett, *John*, 201; Bultmann, *John*, 128; Brown, *John*, 33; Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 352; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 42; and Carson, *John*, 180.

94 As demonstrated by Guilding, *Fourth Gospel*, 171–211; Gaston, *No Stone*, 205–213, and Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 289–335.

95 Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 352.

96 See Levenson, *Program of Restoration of Ezek 40–48*; and Niditch, "Ezek 40–48 in a Visionary Context," 208–224.

Temple—filled with the glory of God, the source of living waters, and the place where God could dwell with His people forever?⁹⁷

The answer to the above would seem to be in the affirmative. Ezekiel's prophecies appear to have provided much in the way of promises, parallels, and phraseology for presenting Jesus as the Temple of God. Brown points to Ezekiel as a primary foundation for the expectation of a new, eschatological Temple in the first century.⁹⁸ Numerous commentators observe intertextual relations between texts in Ezekiel and sections of the Gospel that discuss Temple themes, even though they do not all attach the same weight of influence to Ezekiel.⁹⁹ These serve to strengthen the case for viewing Ezekiel as a major contributor to the new Temple image in John. It would be difficult to imagine the shape that the new Temple theme would take in the Fourth Gospel if there were no Ezekiel. And the theme of Jesus as the new Temple in John points to the future, as Peterson remarks:

To be sure, prior to Jesus' Second Advent, this is the most readily apparent in the spiritual abundance and provision that Christians experience thanks to Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection. However, John's audience, in a post-70 CE and post-temple context, also had a future hope when all of earth's troubles would end and Jesus would be the source of blessings in the here and now, a picture depicted best in the book of Revelation.¹⁰⁰

2 Rivers of Living Water

One of the most dramatic and problematic statements attributed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is found in 7:37–38,¹⁰¹ where, on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, he proclaims: "If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink.

97 These questions are not meant to exclude the possibility that Jesus himself interpreted his life and ministry in light of Ezekiel's promise of a new Temple. However, such possibilities lie outside the limits of proof from the historical-critical standpoint and will not be addressed here.

98 Brown, *John*, 122–123.

99 Barrett, *John*, 233; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 41, 114, 116; Brown, *John*, 32–34, 122–123, 323; Carson, *John*, 130, 179, 219–220, 321–322, 326–328, 331; Gaston, *No Stone*, 209, 211; Guilding, *Fourth Gospel*, 105–106, 188–190, 210; Haenchen, *John*, vol. 2, 17; Marsh, *John*, 109; and Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 122; vol. 2, 155, 350, 431, 440.

100 Peterson, 197.

101 Zane C. Hodges, "Problem Passages in the Gospel of John, Part 7: Rivers of Living Water—John 7:37–39," *BibSac* 136 (1979), 239.

He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, 'Out of his heart¹⁰² shall flow rivers of living water.'" The problems revolve around questions of the punctuation of the passage, the antecedent of αὐτοῦ (identifying the source of the living water), and the source of the scriptural citation.¹⁰³ These questions are best answered in light of the setting for the passage, The Feast of Tabernacles.

2.1 *The Feast of Tabernacles*

The Feast of Tabernacles was one of Israel's three great annual festivals, celebrated with great joy in the autumn to recall Israel's wilderness pilgrimage and to serve as a renewal of the covenant.¹⁰⁴ Celebration of the feast included a daily libation of water taken from the pool of Siloam in solemn procession and poured out in the Temple.¹⁰⁵ The practice was in keeping with rabbinic interpretations of Tabernacles which made special use of Isa 12:3, Ezek 47:1–12, and Zech 13:1; 14:8ff.¹⁰⁶ The daily procession passed through the Water Gate (south of the Temple) which rabbinic tradition held to be so named due to the role of the south gate in Ezek 47:1–9 from which the rivers of water would flow.¹⁰⁷ The Feast of Tabernacles encouraged an expectation of "the abundant gift of living water flowing from Jerusalem when the kingdom of God comes."¹⁰⁸ On the seventh day, the libation was repeated seven times.¹⁰⁹ Following the seventh day, a solemn assembly was held on the eighth day.¹¹⁰ Whether "the last day" in 7:37 refers to the seventh or eighth day is a matter that has not been settled, but either day would have provided a dramatic setting for Jesus' statement.¹¹¹ Another practice is worthy of note:

102 So the RSV. Other translations have "from within him," Brown, *John*, 320; or "from his belly," Bruce H. Grigsby, "If Any Man Thirsts ...": Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7, 37–39," *Biblica* 67 (1986), 101.

103 Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 89.

104 Deut 31:9–13. See also J. C. Rylaarsdam, "Booths, Feast of," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 1, ed. George A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), 455–458.

105 Haenchen, *John*, vol. 2, 17.

106 See the discussion above on the setting of the Feast of Tabernacles, pp. 80–82.

107 Grigsby, "If Any Man Thirsts," 101, 104.

108 Beasley-Murray, *John*, 114. Manning, *Echoes*, 176, notes several Second Temple sources that mention the Feast of the Tabernacles and its water ceremonies, including *Sukk.* 1.1–2.4; 4.9; 5.3–1; *b. Sukk.* 5.48b; 5.53a; 5.55a; *Peshikta Rabbati* 52.4.6; *b. Megillah* 31a; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.245–47; 8.100, 123; 11.154–57; 13.241–47, 372–73, 15.50; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 2.213.

109 Rylaarsdam, "Booths," 456.

110 *Ibid.*

111 Schnackenburg favors the seventh day when the priests circled the altar seven times as the best setting, *John*, vol. 2, 152. Barrett favors the eighth day, but admits that it likely

Each day at dawn there was a solemn rite carried out by the priests. At cockcrow they proceeded to the E gate of the temple area. Then, at the moment of sunrise, they turned W to face the temple and recited: "Our fathers when they were in this place turned with their faces toward the east, and they worshiped the sun toward the east; but as for us, our eyes are turned toward the Lord."¹¹²

This practice recalled the actions of the people in Ezek 8:16¹¹³ when God's glory was eventually driven from the Temple due to their wickedness. Another aspect of Ezekiel's visions had been woven into the fabric of the Feast.

2.2 *Punctuation and Antecedent of αὐτοῦ*

An alternate translation from the RSV above is provided by Grigsby: "If any man thirsts, let him come to me; and let him drink who believes in me. As the scripture said, 'from his belly shall flow rivers of living water.'"¹¹⁴ According to Grigsby, this translation is based upon an acceptance of the so-called "Western" punctuation (originally accepted only by the Western church fathers) of v. 38. It involves a full stop after ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ in v. 38 and no punctuation after πινέτω in v. 37.¹¹⁵ It clearly makes Jesus the source of the living waters as opposed to other translations which leave the source ambiguous and allow the believer to be the one from whom the waters flow.¹¹⁶ While it cannot be certain that this punctuation is to be preferred, it fits well with John's handling of the one who hungers and thirsts in 6:35,¹¹⁷ it removes the awkwardness of "as the scripture has said" being encapsulated between the suspended subject and its sentence,¹¹⁸ and it reflects a chiasmic parallelism which is characteristic of John's style.¹¹⁹

did not matter to John as he wrote the Gospel whether the seventh day or the eighth is intended, *John*, 326.

112 Rylaarsdam, "Booths," 456.

113 Ibid.

114 Bruce H. Grigsby, "If Any Man Thirsts," 101. G. D. Kilpatrick provides a slight variation with: "If anyone is thirsty, let him who believes in me come to me and drink," in "The Punctuation of John 7:37-38," *JTS* 11 (1960), 340-342.

115 Ibid.

116 For a discussion of these possibilities see Brown, *John*, 320-321. In support of the believer being referred to in this passage, see Juan B. Cortes, "Yet Another Look at John 7:37-38," *CBQ* 29 (1967), 75-86.

117 So Beasley-Murray, *John*, 115.

118 In the alternate, it falls between two complete sentences. So Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (New Century Bible; Greenwood, S. C.: Oliphants, 1972), 298.

119 Brown, *John*, 321. However, we do well to humbly recognize that a definitive answer is still lacking. As Rhonda G. Crutcher (*That He Might Be Revealed: Water Imagery and the Identity of Jesus in the Gospel of John* [Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2015], 140) notes, "Despite

2.3 *Scripture Citation*

Clearly, the choice of punctuation has a bearing on the scripture reference one chooses to satisfy “as the scripture has said.” Those who accept that the believer is in focus for “out of his heart” often cite Prov 4:23, 5:15, 18:4; Isa 58:11; Zech 14:8; and Sirach 24:30–33.¹²⁰ But these hardly come close to matching Jesus’ statement.¹²¹ Admittedly, the citations provided to explain Jesus’ statement based upon the assumption that he is the source of living waters are not without difficulty either. There is no exact, or near exact, Old Testament passage to satisfy “as the scripture has said” and it is likely an allusion to multiple Old Testament texts was in mind.¹²²

Two different streams of tradition tend to be called upon to explain “rivers of living water” flowing from Jesus. One looks back to the rock in the wilderness (Exodus 17:1–7) from which water flowed when the children of Israel were thirsty. In support of this tradition commentators cite Isa 43:20, 44:3, 48:21; Deut 8:15; Pss 78:16, 116:8, and 128:15–16.¹²³ This would certainly be consistent with John’s predilection for symbols taken from the Exodus narratives.¹²⁴ The other strain of tradition, that of the eschatological streams that flow from the Temple in Ezek 47:1–12 and Zech 14:8, also has strong support.¹²⁵ At this point it is probably unnecessary to choose between the two traditions for the background to Jesus’ statement. Both traditions were combined in the background to the water ceremony of the Feast and both are important to understanding the meaning of Jesus in 7:38.¹²⁶ Besides, there is substantial evidence that the early Christian church viewed Jesus as both the rock of the wilderness and the new Temple under the notion that Jesus was the Temple rock.¹²⁷

centuries of work by the world’s best scholars on this subject a consensus about which of these interpretations is best has never been reached, and it seems that historical critical methods of examination have left the debate at a stalemate.”

120 Cortes, “Another Look,” 85.

121 J. Ramsey Michaels, *John*, 145.

122 Beasley-Murray, *John*, 116.

123 Brown, *John*, 322. Ps 116 was one of the Hallel psalms sung during the procession of Tabernacles; *ibid.* Some of these were used as lectionary readings during the month in which the Feast took place; Guilding, *Fourth Gospel*, 103. See Beasley-Murray, *John*, 116; Talbert, *Reading John*, 149; Grigsby, “If Any Man Thirst,” 107.

124 Brown, *John*, 322.

125 William H. Brownlee, “Whence the Gospel According to John?” in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1990), 187; Michaels, *John*, 145; Brown, *John*, 322; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 116; and Hodges, “Rivers of Living Water,” 245; to name a few.

126 So Talbert, *Reading John*, 148–149; Grigsby, “If Any Man Thirsts,” 105–107; and Brown, *John*, 323. One of the first to cite this combination of traditions was Pierre Grelot, “Jean VII, 38, eau du rocher ou source du Temple?” *Revue Biblique* 70 (1963), 43–51.

127 Daniélou, “Jean VII, 37–39,” 161.

2.4 *Conclusions and Implications*

Ezekiel, it would seem, was a contributor to the theme of “rivers of living water” in 7:37–38. Some commentators are even willing to give him a primary role in providing the substance for “as the scripture has said.”¹²⁸ Several factors can be observed: 1) in Ezekiel the river flows from the new Temple and Jesus is the embodiment of the Temple for John; 2) in Ezek 47:5 the waters are a river (singular) but in 47:9 the dual form is used which provides a parallel with “*rivers* (plural) of living water” in John 7:38;¹²⁹ 3) the river in Ezekiel brings life wherever it goes (47:9) and thus can function as a parallel to “rivers of *living* water;”¹³⁰ 4) Ezekiel served as a major component in rabbinic interpretations of the Feast of Tabernacles;¹³¹ 5) the gate that the water ceremony procession came through recalled the new Temple passage of Ezekiel;¹³² and 6) Revelation 22:1–2 takes up the theme of Ezekiel’s river of life flowing from “the throne of God and the Lamb” and follows it with an invitation similar to Jesus’ invitation to the thirsty in John 7:37–38: “Let him who is thirsty come, let him who wishes take the water of life freely (Revelation 22:17).”¹³³ Hodges, in concluding his discussion of John 7:37–38, has said:

The purport of all this, *if the Ezekiel passage is kept in mind* [italics mine], becomes plain. At the great climax of the Jewish festival year, the Son of God perceives the spiritual thirst of those whose hopes were wrapped up in a system of earthly ordinances and rituals. Standing up before them as the true Source of living water, He cries out for all to hear the gracious invitation to partake of the water of life from Him.¹³⁴

Of course, Ezekiel’s is not the only voice in the chorus to be heard here, but he certainly seems to be carrying the melody.

If this is true, then a stronger case can be made for the alternate punctuation that clearly points to Jesus, the new Temple, as the source of “rivers of living water” (John 7:37–38) which flow from the very threshold of the Temple

¹²⁸ Ibid., 158–163; Hodges, “Rivers,” 245–248.

¹²⁹ Brownlee, “Whence John,” 186.

¹³⁰ Grigsby, “If Any Man Thirsts,” 105–106.

¹³¹ Talbert, *Reading John*, 148–149; et al.

¹³² Grigsby, “If Any Man Thirsts,” 105.

¹³³ Beasley-Murray, *John*, 116. The appeal to the book of Revelation is not an attempt to insist upon common authorship of the Gospel and the Apocalypse, but it is evidence that, within the Johannine school, the themes of a river of life and slacking one’s thirst were united in a common tradition looking back to Ezek 47.

¹³⁴ Hodges, “Rivers of Living Water,” 247.

(Ezek 47:1–2). And the water that flowed from his side in 19:34 at the crucifixion might indeed be reminiscent of the water that was to be given only after he was first glorified (7:39) so that “the Lord becomes the source of living water when he is ‘lifted up’ on his cross and so to heaven.”¹³⁵

3 The Good Shepherd

Of all the passages in the Fourth Gospel for which an intertextual relationship with the prophecies of Ezekiel has been suggested, the Good Shepherd discourse in John 10 is most generally accepted as being attributable to Ezekiel.¹³⁶ It is extremely rare for a commentator to deny that John 10 is to be interpreted in light of Ezek 34.¹³⁷ Martin’s opinion is that: “The whole narrative (10:1–18) is to be read against the background of Ezekiel’s prophecy of God’s argument with the shepherds of Israel (chap. 34).”¹³⁸ Dodd boldly proposes that the discourse “is not fully to be understood without reference to a passage in the Old Testament which *must* [*italics mine*] have been in the author’s mind,” and then he identifies Ezek 34 as that passage.¹³⁹

3.1 *The Setting of John 10*

The Good Shepherd discourse follows hard on the heels of Jesus’ healing of the man born blind in chapter 9. Dodd indicates that the judicial sentence pronounced by Jesus toward some Pharisees at the end of chapter 9 leads without interruption to the discourse of the shepherd and the flock.¹⁴⁰ In that passage the man who had been healed was roughly treated by a group of the Pharisees

¹³⁵ Beasley-Murray, *John*, 116. Klein has also observed a possible connection between the stream of Ezek 47 with the water that flowed from Jesus’ side in John 19:34; *Ezekiel*, 182.

¹³⁶ For example, Manning, 100–134, lists it as the first of the “major allusions” in John to Ezekiel.

¹³⁷ One of the few is D. M. G. Stalker, who flatly denies that the Good Shepherd of John 10 echoes Ezekiel; *Ezekiel* (Torch Bible Commentaries; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1968), 41. Stalker believes that the image was prevalent in the ancient Near East and does not need Ezekiel to explain its presence in John.

¹³⁸ James Martin, “John 10:1–10,” *Int* 32 (1978), 172.

¹³⁹ Dodd, *Interpretation*, 358. Dodd’s comment is interesting when one observes that Robert Kysar in “Johannine Metaphor—Meaning and Function: A Literary Case Study of John 10:1–18,” *Semeia* 53 (1991), 81–11, can write an entire article on the passage and never once mention Ezekiel in either text or notes. He makes the same omission in *John’s Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

and expelled from the synagogue (9:34).¹⁴¹ By way of contrast, Jesus seeks him out, leads the man to believe in him, with the result that he worships, as it were, at the new Temple (9:35–38).¹⁴² Jesus speaks a word about judgment and answers in the affirmative to the Pharisees who ask about their guilt (9:39–41). The parable of the door seems to be addressed to “them” (10:6) although they do not understand it.¹⁴³ That a connection is to be made between the events in chapter 9 and the discourse in chapter 10 would be difficult to deny.

Another significant contextual matter is the possibility that these events took place around the Feast of Dedication (Hanukkah).¹⁴⁴ Hunter has pointed out that “Shepherd” readings were common in the synagogues around Dedication time, and Ezek 34 (which he believes is the most important passage for understanding John 10) was one of the Dedication *haphtharoth*.¹⁴⁵ Brown remarks:

If Jesus really spoke in Jerusalem during the Feast of Dedication, what topic would have been more natural than the readings the people had recently heard in the synagogues, or soon would hear?¹⁴⁶

141 So Marsh; *John*, 387. John uses ἐξβάλλω (“cast out”) in 9:34 to describe the situation, while his normal terminology for being expelled from the synagogue is ἀποσυνάγωγος (9:22; 12:42; 16:2). As noted in Robert W. Yarbrough, 1–3 *John* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 380. Brown (*John*, 375) is inclined to see the man’s treatment as a simple ejection from their immediate presence. Morris (*John*, 493), however, affirms the probability that it represents some kind of stronger disciplinary action. The text points out the fear on the part of the man’s parents that they would be “put out of the synagogue” if they are found to confess Jesus as the Christ (9:22), making it more likely that some form of formal rejection is in view here.

142 John has prepared his readers to understand this, first by presenting Jesus as the new Temple, and then by the teaching in chapter 4 that “neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father,” but that “those who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.”

143 Martin, “John 10:1–10,” 171.

144 Brown admits that the issue of chronology is vague in these chapters; *John*, 376. Lindars takes the meaning of 10:22 to refer back to 9:1; *John*, 366. Haenchen connects 10:22 with what follows, *John*, vol. 2, 49. We agree with Westcott (*John*, 127) and Talbert (*Reading John*, 168), who hold that links with the Feast of Dedication are strong and that the passage is to be interpreted in that light. Even if the Feast of Dedication does not figure into the picture chronologically until 10:22, it is linked in the narrative with shepherd/sheep language both before and after 10:22. It is likely that John intended the passage to be understood with an eye toward the significance of Dedication. A proposed theory of dislocation would place 10:19–29 before 10:1–18 and settle this problem, F. Warburton Lewis, *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), but such a move has no textual support.

145 A. M. Hunter, *According to John* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968), 98.

146 Brown, *John*, 405.

The Feast of Dedication then, and the Old Testament scriptures connected with it, are important to keep in mind when interpreting John 10. John's statements of timing have significance beyond mere chronology.¹⁴⁷

3.2 *Old Testament Imagery*

Part of Stalker's objection to seeing Ezek 34 as the background to John 10 is the magnitude of shepherd imagery in the Old Testament and throughout the ancient Near East.¹⁴⁸ Gen 46:31–34, 48:15; Deut 22:1; Num 27:17; 1 Sam 17; Isa 40:11, 49:9–10, 56:11, 63:11; Jer 3:15, 10:21, 23:1–8, 25:34–38; Micah 2:12, 4:6–8; Zech 11:4–17; Pss 23, 77:21, 78:52, 78:70–72, 80:1, 95:7, 100:3; and Ezek 34 are a sampling of the Old Testament passages that have been cited in the literature on the passage.¹⁴⁹ Indeed, one does not have to look far to find the figures of shepherd and sheep.¹⁵⁰ According to Evans, the Old Testament provides all the essential imagery and vocabulary for the Good Shepherd discourse, with the exception of the shepherd's laying down his life.¹⁵¹ For Talbert, one finds the dominant threads of the language of John about sheep and shepherds in the 34th chapter of Ezekiel.¹⁵²

3.3 *Ezekiel's Shepherd*

In Ezek 34 God gives him a woe oracle¹⁵³ to proclaim against the shepherds (political leaders) of Israel. The leaders have been little more than parasites, living off the people, profiting from their positions, but doing nothing to exercise the responsibilities of their offices.¹⁵⁴ Besides this, they have lorded it over the people with harshness and cruelty so that they are a scattered people (34:4–5). God will move against the shepherds in judgment to put an end to their tyranny (34:10).

¹⁴⁷ Like the double meaning implied when Judas went out "and it was night" (13:30). On double and multiple meanings see Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 165. Similarly the point that "it was winter" could describe the spiritual climate; so Beasley-Murray, *John*, 173.

¹⁴⁸ Stalker, *Ezekiel*, 41.

¹⁴⁹ These have been provided by Talbert, *Reading John*, 167–168; Kenneth E. Bailey, "The Shepherd Poems of John 10: Their Culture and Style," *TR* 14 (1993), 3–21; and Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (JSNTS 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 28–29.

¹⁵⁰ Bultmann alludes to certain Old Testament passages, including Ezekiel, but goes on to draw primarily upon Mandaean (Gnostic) sources as the probable source of John's shepherd image, *John*, 364–369. Evans evaluates Bultmann's sources and finds them lacking in light of closer Old Testament parallels; *Word and Glory*, 33–36.

¹⁵¹ Evans, *Word and Glory*, 32.

¹⁵² Talbert, *Reading John*, 168.

¹⁵³ Wevers, 257.

¹⁵⁴ Vawter and Hoppe, *A New Heart*, 154–155.

But God's intervention will go beyond judging the shepherds; it will include His personal care being extended to the sheep. He will search for them, restore them, feed (βόσχω) them, and shepherd (ποιμαίνω) them (34:11–16). He will put an end to sheep treating each other harshly as well (34:17–22). Furthermore, “though God promises to be the good shepherd in place of the former faithless shepherds, he also promises to raise up an ideal earthly counterpart shepherd to rule with him.”¹⁵⁵ His servant David will be one shepherd over them (34:23). God will renew a covenant of peace with the people, cause them to dwell securely in the land, and He will bless them so that they “shall know that I am the Lord” (34:25–31).

A companion passage is found in 37:15–23. There Ezekiel is called upon to bind two sticks together symbolizing the uniting of Israel and Judah into one nation again (37:19). David will be prince and shepherd over them, and God will set His sanctuary in their midst to dwell among them forever (37:25, 27). The theme of a covenant of peace surfaces here as well (37:26), and the stated purpose changes slightly to “that the nations will know that I the Lord sanctify Israel” (37:28).

3.4 *The Good Shepherd in John's Gospel*

In the Fourth Gospel, the Good Shepherd is in obvious contrast to the harsh religious leaders of chapter 9.¹⁵⁶ He knows his sheep, leads them out, cares for them, protects them, and even lays his life down for them. The sheep know the shepherd and respond to his voice. He brings all his sheep together into one flock.¹⁵⁷ The sheep are safe in his care for the Father holds them securely as well. In a related passage, John 21:15–17, Jesus the Good Shepherd commissions Peter to feed (βόσχω) and shepherd (ποιμαίνω) his lambs and sheep.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ Klein, *Ezekiel*, 123.

¹⁵⁶ Michaels, *John*, 175.

¹⁵⁷ As Richard Bauckham [*Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baler Academic, 2015), 30] remarks, John's “one flock, one shepherd” claim “goes further in anticipating the uniting of Jews and Gentiles into a single people of God. This is the Johannine version of Paul's concern that the Jewish and Gentile believers should not be two separated communities but rather form one people of God.” Further, as Lori Baron [“The Shema in John's Gospel and Jewish Restorationist Eschatology,” in *John and Judaism: A Contested Relationship in Context*, eds. R. Alan Culpepper and Paul N. Anderson (RBS 87; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 165–174, at p. 167, notes, the “one” language of John 10 and Ezek 34 emphasizes the oneness of God found in the Shema: “For John, believing in Jesus is no violation of monotheism; Jesus has not ‘made himself’ God's equal.... Jesus is no threat to the divine unity—he exists within it.”

¹⁵⁸ Brown believes the vocabulary here echoes that of Ezek 34:14–15; *John*, 1105.

3.5 *Comparisons and Conclusions*

A number of striking parallels appear.¹⁵⁹ The shepherds (current leaders) in both Ezekiel and John need to be replaced because they have failed to care for the people. In Ezek 34 the sheep have their wool taken, some are killed, and others abandoned as prey to wild animals. In John 10 Jesus says that the ones who came before were intent to “steal, kill, and destroy.” They are as the hirelings who abandon the sheep to wolves. The sheep in Ezekiel are scattered (34:5) and even pushed out by other sheep (34:20–22). In John the wolves scatter the sheep (10:12) and the Pharisees have expelled from God’s flock the man whom Christ came to gather (9:34).¹⁶⁰ Judgment on the false shepherds gives way to promises of deliverance and care for the sheep. The sheep will be led (ἐξάγω; Ezek 34:13 and John 10:3), fed (βόσκω; Ezek 34:8, 14 and John 21:17) in good pasture (νομή; Ezek 34:14 and John 10:9), and protected.¹⁶¹ The good grazing land and fat pasture of Ezek 34:14 compares favorably to the abundant life of John 10:10. As the people will “know [γινώσκω] that I am [ἐγώ εἰμι] the Lord” and “that I am [ἐγώ εἰμι] with them” in Ezek 34:27, 30, so the sheep in Jesus’ discourse know [γινώσκω] both the shepherd’s voice, and the shepherd (10:3, 5, 14).¹⁶² In Ezekiel God promises to shepherd His people and then does so through His representative David (34:15, 23) and in John’s Gospel Jesus, who is one with the Father, shepherds the flock in the Father’s name (10:25–30). Both passages have the sheep dwelling securely (Ezek 34:25 and John 10:27–29). Both have one shepherd (Ezek 34:23 and John 10:16). Both have the sheep being gathered into one fold (Ezek 34:11–13, 37:15–23 and John 10:16).¹⁶³ The commentators are justified who connect these texts.

So what is the import of this narrative in the scheme of John’s Gospel? What christological significance does it have? Ezekiel had shared God’s promise of a new shepherd; he referred to him as David (34:23–24 and 37:24). The background in Ezekiel was so laden with messianic overtones that when Jesus proclaims himself to be the Good Shepherd the claim to messiahship is all but

¹⁵⁹ We are indebted to Dodd, *Interpretation*, 358–361, for identifying many of these parallels.

¹⁶⁰ Dodd, *Interpretation*, 359.

¹⁶¹ Evans, *Word and Glory*, 28–31. Dodd also sees much here in the way of shared vocabulary: common verbs are forms of ἄγω, σῶζω, ἀναστήσω, and γινώσκω; common nouns are νομή, πρόβατα, and ποιμήν. So Dodd, *Interpretation*, 358–359.

¹⁶² And, as Klein points out, later in John 10:38 Jesus calls upon the people to believe his signs (his care of the sheep/blind man?) “that you may know and understand that the Father is in me and I am in the Father”; Klein, *Ezekiel*, 124.

¹⁶³ H. B. Kossen claims that it is general opinion to see both Ezek 34 and 37 as lying behind the one flock of John 10; “Who Were the Greeks in John 12:20?” *Studies in John* (NovTSup 24; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 107.

explicit.¹⁶⁴ It remains veiled here because Jesus must communicate to the people “what the Messiah really is, the Son who being one with the Father is the Giver of eternal life.”¹⁶⁵ But it is obvious enough to prompt the Jews to demand of him: “How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Christ (Messiah), tell us plainly” (10:24). Jesus replies with language that sustains his claim to be the Good Shepherd:

I told you and you do not believe. The works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness to me; but you do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand. My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all, and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father’s hand. I and the Father are one (10:25–30).

It seems that Jesus’ presentation of himself as the Good Shepherd who would unite his sheep into one flock under one shepherd was understood by the Jews as a claim to be the shepherd of Ezekiel’s prophecy, God’s servant David, the coming Messiah.¹⁶⁶ It is difficult to believe, in light of the close associations of the Feast of Dedication with its shepherd focus, that John did not intend for his readers to reach such a conclusion. Hays’ argues:

The promise that there would be “one flock, one shepherd” echoes two passages in Ezekiel [Ezek 34:23–24 and 37:15–23] that speak of a coming Davidic king who will bring justice to the land and care for the people with compassion.... It seems clear then, that Jesus’ use of the image of the good shepherd stakes his claim to be the hoped-for king who will unite the people of Israel and bring about eschatological justice.¹⁶⁷

One other observation might be made in regard to the intertextual relationship in this passage. The Feast of Dedication celebrated the recapture and reconsecration of the Temple in 165 BC by Judas Maccabaeus after its desecration by the Greeks under Antiochus Epiphanes and was a time of great messianic expectation.¹⁶⁸ It represented the return of the Shekinah and the restoration of the Temple as well as the coming of the messianic shepherd.¹⁶⁹ In John’s

¹⁶⁴ Dodd, *Interpretation*, 361.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Guilding, *Fourth Gospel*, 132.

¹⁶⁷ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 340–341.

¹⁶⁸ Michaels, *John*, 185.

¹⁶⁹ Guilding, *Fourth Gospel*, 129–132.

Gospel Jesus is the Temple of God (2:19–21) who comes to shepherd the people of God (10:1–18). The Good Shepherd is also “the one whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world” (10:36). Both in the celebrations of the Feast of Dedication, and in the narrative of John’s Gospel, there is an intertwining of the themes of shepherd and sanctuary. Is there a background text which prepares for such a combination of images? Consider Ezek 37:24–28:

My servant David shall be king over them; and they shall all have one shepherd. They shall follow my ordinances and be careful to observe my statutes. They shall dwell in the land where your fathers dwelt that I gave to my servant Jacob; they and their children and their children’s children shall dwell there for ever; and David my servant shall be their prince for ever. I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will bless them and multiple them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My dwelling place shall be with them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Then the nations will know that I the Lord sanctify Israel when my sanctuary is in the midst of them for evermore.

The Good Shepherd figure (drawn from Ezekiel’s prophecies) helps to complete the Johannine theme that Jesus is the embodiment of every major Jewish institution.¹⁷⁰

4 The Resurrection

Marsh has some glowing comments concerning the importance of the 11th chapter for the Fourth Gospel:

This chapter might well be called the *crux interpretationis* of the whole gospel; certainly a great deal of what may be said about other chapters, earlier as well as later, turns upon what is said about the raising of Lazarus ... The story of the raising of Lazarus is not simply the crown and interpretative medium of the miraculous raisings from the dead found in the synoptic gospels, it is also the crown and interpretive crux of the whole set of Johannine “signs”.... Jesus utters what is perhaps the very greatest saying in the Bible, certainly the greatest of the “I am” sayings that John records: “I am the resurrection and the life” (v. 25).¹⁷¹

¹⁷⁰ Davies, *Gospel and Land*, 296.

¹⁷¹ Marsh, *John*, 415, 416, 427–428.

While other commentators may wish to debate the extreme nature of Marsh's comments, his words do reflect a legitimate sense of the importance of this chapter for John's story line. Beasley-Murray observes:

That the evangelist's selection of the signs of Jesus should end with the account of the raising of Lazarus is entirely fitting, not only because of its stupendous nature, or because it was chronologically the last, but above all by reason of its meaning. More plainly than any other sign of Jesus it brings into relief the meaning of them all, namely that Jesus is the Redeemer, who by his living, working, dying, and rising brings to all humankind the life of the kingdom of God. Moreover it makes transparently clear that in order for the life of the kingdom to come to the world Jesus must give his own life—and take it again!¹⁷²

If the greatest saying and the greatest sign are both to be found in John 11, it would be reasonable to assume that the ideas and images found there are of enormous importance to the Evangelist, and that whatever or whoever inspired these images (in addition to Jesus himself) held significant influence in his thought. What is the background for the 11th chapter?

4.1 *Chapter 5 as Precedent to Chapter 11*

Before discussing chapter 11, it is appropriate to explore a related passage—John 5:19–30.¹⁷³ In 5:19–20, Jesus makes the claim that he only works in conjunction with the Father and that the Father is pleased to involve Jesus in all that He is doing. Greater works than these (the healing of the man by the pool in 5:1–9) are promised so that the people to whom Jesus is speaking may marvel. Then Jesus gives an example of a work of the Father that he also is able to do: “For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom He will” (5:21). The claim is amazing. Jesus asserts that he has the authority from the Father to give life to people.

In the Old Testament, the power of life was God's alone—Deut 32:39, 1 Sam 2:6, and 2 Kings 5:7.¹⁷⁴ It was only a very late development in Second Temple

¹⁷² G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 68.

¹⁷³ Some of the commentators who have called attention to the inter-relatedness of these chapters are: Barrett, *John*, 260; Brown, *John*, 220, 447; Marsh, *John*, 265; and Talbert, *Reading John*, 173. Brown comments that the relationship is so close that some have suggested that the Lazarus story goes in the earlier context of chapter 5; *John*, 428–429, 437.

¹⁷⁴ Morris, *John*, 314. Morris includes a lengthy list of Old Testament passages linking life with God on 318–319.

Judiasm that the Messiah was believed to have power to raise the dead.¹⁷⁵ The standard position on the issue is expressed in a rabbinic quotation cited by Morris:

Three keys are in the hand of God and they are not given into the hand of any agent, namely that of rain (Deut 28:12), that of the womb (Gen 30:22), and that of the raising of the dead (Ezek 37:13).¹⁷⁶

Obviously, Jesus is claiming that he can do what Jewish tradition affirms that only God can do. This could not have gone unnoticed by Jesus' listeners or John's readers. It is a major declaration about the relationship that Jesus shares with the Father.

Furthermore, Jesus claims not only the power to give life, but also the prerogative of judgment: "The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son, that all may honor the Son" (5:22–23). The crucial point of this judgment revolves around one's response to Jesus: "He who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life" (5:24). Two noteworthy statements follow:

The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live (5:25); [and]

The hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice [the Son of man's] and come forth, those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of judgment (5:28–29).¹⁷⁷

Much has been made about the eschatological outlook of John's Gospel.¹⁷⁸ The passages appear to have a blending of both realized (present) and futuristic

¹⁷⁵ Marsh, *John*, 261.

¹⁷⁶ Morris, *John*, 314. Scripture passages in parentheses are part of the original quotation.

¹⁷⁷ Brown believes that this saying echoes Daniel 12:2, the first Old Testament passage to proclaim clearly a resurrection into an afterlife; John, 220. It is interesting that Michael V. Fox has argued that the doctrine of corporeal resurrection in Daniel 12:2–3 is likely dependent upon Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones in Ezek 37; "The Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of Dry Bones," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 51 (1980), 12. The statements here in 5:25 and 5:28–29 likely point to two different groups of people, the spiritually dead and the physically dead. Both statements echo the language of Ezekiel.

¹⁷⁸ For a recent discussion see John T. Carroll, "Present and Future in Fourth Gospel 'Eschatology,'" *BibThBul* 19 (1989), 63–68.

eschatology.¹⁷⁹ Present possession of eternal life is not the resurrection from the dead,¹⁸⁰ but in John's Gospel they are tightly bound together in the person of Jesus.¹⁸¹ This will become more evident in Jesus' "I am" statement in chapter 11 where the future is transferred to the present in Jesus.¹⁸²

So, chapter 5 looks forward to chapter 11. What Jesus claims authority to do in terms of raising the dead (5:25–29), he will demonstrate in raising Lazarus (11:43–44). Chapter 11 will act out the promise of chapter 5.¹⁸³ There the Son of man will cry out with a loud voice to call Lazarus who is dead and in the tomb. Lazarus will be raised to life and come forth. The reader has been prepared.

4.2 *The Resurrection and the Life, John 11*

As has been noted, there is a convergence in John 11 of a profound saying, "I am the resurrection and the life,"¹⁸⁴ and a stupendous sign, the raising of Lazarus. The chapter begins with Jesus receiving word that Lazarus is ill, followed by an unexplained delay of two days (11:1–6). When he does decide to go to Lazarus the disciples first object, then misunderstand his statement about Lazarus being asleep, but finally realize that he is going to Lazarus' side even though Lazarus is dead (11:7–14). The purpose of Lazarus' illness and death is given as "for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it" (11:4).

When Jesus arrives in Bethany, he is first met by Martha who expresses her belief that Jesus could have forestalled her brother's death had he been there at the time, and then she hints that Jesus might even bring him back from the dead (11:21–22).¹⁸⁵ Jesus' reply takes the form of a promise: "Your brother will rise again." To this Martha acknowledges her belief in a general eschatological resurrection in which her brother will participate (11:23–24).¹⁸⁶ Jesus then

179 Talbert refers to 5:24 and 25 as present eschatology, and 29 as a cosmic, future eschatology; *Reading John*, 126.

180 Ibid.

181 Marsh, *John*, 429.

182 Ibid., 428.

183 Brown, *John*, 437.

184 A textual variant would omit "and the life" (p^{45vid}, I¹, Syr^s). A standard canon of textual criticism is that the shorter reading is to be preferred. However, in light of the vast textual evidence, it seems best to explain the omission as accidental, or due to the omission of "life" in v. 24; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 183.

185 Talbert, *Reading John*, 173.

186 Ibid. According to Lindars, Martha's answer represented a considerable body of Jewish opinion based upon passages such as Dan 12:2, 1 Enoch 41–57, and Psalms of Solomon 3:12; *John*, 394–395. Haenchen includes Ezek 37:1–14 as background for this belief; *John*, vol. 2, 62. Talbert points out that the promise of Jesus and the verbalization of Martha is entirely

proclaims, "I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whoever lives and believes in me shall never die" (11:25–26). He links the eschatological event with his own person and makes it clear that "far from ... having to wait until some distant and undefined last day ... the real resurrection takes place in and through himself."¹⁸⁷

Jesus lingers until Martha brings Mary who expresses the same dismay over his earlier absence (11:28–32). Saying little he asks to be taken to the place where Lazarus has been buried, where he weeps (11:35).¹⁸⁸ At the tomb, he commands that the stone be taken away and Martha objects, "Lord, by this time there will be an odor, for he has been dead four days,"¹⁸⁹ but Jesus encourages her to trust and see the glory of God (11:38–40). The stone is taken away and Jesus offers thanks to the Father for hearing him and admits that his prayer is so that those present may believe that the Father has sent him (11:41–42). He then cries out, "Lazarus, come out,"¹⁹⁰ and Lazarus emerges alive but still bound by the grave clothes which Jesus commands to be removed (11:43–44).¹⁹¹ The claims of Jesus in chapter 5 are thus validated in the raising of Lazarus. Jesus has given physical life as a sign of his power to give eternal life on this earth (realized eschatology) and as a promise that on the last day he will raise the dead (final eschatology).¹⁹²

The last sign of Jesus is climactic in its power as a witness to his person, and also in that it precedes and precipitates his own death and resurrection.¹⁹³

in keeping with what the Pharisees believed about a future resurrection, in contrast with the Sadducees who denied it and the Essenes who held to the immortality of the soul; *Reading John*, 173.

187 Marsh, *John*, 428–429.

188 Peterson, 87 n. 75, notes the important detail that the vocabulary of the weeping of the people (11:31, 33) and Jesus' weeping (11:35) is different. Whereas the people weep (κλαίω; cf. Ezek 24:23), John uses a form of δακρύω to describe Jesus' weeping. This is the only use of δακρύω in the NT, and it is only found in the LXX in Ezek 27:35.

189 The mention of the fourth day would have alluded to the loss of any hope for Lazarus at this point. Jewish tradition made allowance for souls visiting the grave for three days in hopes of a return to the body. The process of decomposition made that hope impossible after the third day. Four days established that it was over for Lazarus, even if Jesus could have raised him earlier; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 189–190.

190 Michaels remarks: "He calls Lazarus by name with the authority given him by the Father (5:21, 25–26);" *John*, 204. The text is also reminiscent of 10:4, "he calls his own sheep by name and leads them out."

191 Culpepper explains that his is not a resurrection like Jesus' for he is still bound by the grave clothes. Lazarus represents the disciple to whom life has been given and challenges the reader to accept the realization of eschatological expectations in Jesus; *Anatomy*, 141.

192 Brown, *John*, 437.

193 Beasley-Murray, *John*, 186.

As a result of this sign the Jewish authorities decide that Jesus must be destroyed (11:47–53). The words of Caiaphas over their deliberations are poignant: “You know nothing at all; you do not understand that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish” (11:49–50). John explains that Caiaphas said this by prophecy, being the high priest, and adds that Jesus was to die “not for the nation (Israel) only, but to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad” (11:52). The Good Shepherd who would lay down his life for the sheep will indeed have to do so, and in doing so he will gather together the scattered people of God.¹⁹⁴

Again the question—what is the background for the sign and sayings of John 5 and 11? Perhaps the best clue is found in Brown’s remark concerning Jesus’ words in 5:25–29:

This ... resurrection of the physically dead, and their coming forth from the tomb at the voice of Jesus is an apocalyptic scene not unworthy of Ezekiel’s vision of the revivifying of the dead bones (xxxvii 4: “O dry bones, hear the word of the Lord”).¹⁹⁵

Only a few commentators have observed connections of these chapters in John with Ezek 37.¹⁹⁶ A survey of Ezekiel’s dry bones is therefore in order.

4.3 *Ezek 37 and the Valley of Dry Bones*

The destruction of the Temple in 587 BC altered the mood among the exiles in Babylon. Prior to the fall of Jerusalem false prophets promised that the people would be able to return soon to their homeland with the result that the “exiles clung to a false hope.”¹⁹⁷ The people failed to grasp the gravity of their situation until the Temple was destroyed and the city razed. Reality began

¹⁹⁴ Talbert, *Reading John*, 177.

¹⁹⁵ Brown, *John*, 220.

¹⁹⁶ Brown, *John*, 220; and Haenchen, *John*, vol. 2, 62, are two of the few that do. A whole host of other commentators are silent about Ezekiel when interpreting these texts; Bultmann, Beasley-Murray, Marsh, Michaels, Sanders and Mastin, and Westcott are examples. Lindars connects Ezek 34 only with the ingathering of John 11:52 and omits Ezek 37:21–24 entirely. His only other citation of Ezekiel is in John 11:20 when he recalls Ezek 8:14 as illustrating the proper posture for mourning (sitting) in reference to Mary sitting; *John*, 408. Barrett (*John*, 407) and Talbert (*Reading John*, 177) also fail to connect Ezekiel with these texts except at the point of the ingathering in 11:52. This oversight seems nothing short of amazing considering the parallels.

¹⁹⁷ Joel Kenneth Eakins, “Ezekiel’s Influence on the Exilic Isaiah,” (Ph.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970), 44–45.

to sink in. Hopelessness and despair, already inherent in their exile, became overwhelming.¹⁹⁸ A crisis in life brought with it a crisis in theology—where was Yahweh, His power, and His justice?¹⁹⁹ It was about this time that Ezekiel's prophecies began to turn from hammering Israel's failure and inadequacy to presenting a new hope.²⁰⁰ Ezek 34 gave God's promise to shepherd His people personally and through His servant David. Ezek 36 recorded God's promise to sanctify His name among the nations. This would include the cleansing and spirit-infusing of the nation. The themes of chapter 37 then are the outworking of the sanctifying of His name in chapter 36: by enlivening Israel (37:1–14), by uniting Israel (37:15–24a), and by sanctifying Israel (37:24b–28).²⁰¹

The occasion of Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones was the hopeless despair of the exiles. From the human viewpoint the nation was a graveyard of bones, very dry bones.²⁰² God carried Ezekiel there by His Spirit and asked the "Son of man" if these dry bones can live (37:1–2). Ezekiel was wise to leave such matters in God's hands, for indeed, God is the living one²⁰³ and the one who has the prerogative to determine who lives and who dies (18:8–23). God then tells Ezekiel to prophesy to the bones: "Hear the word of the Lord.... I will cause breath to enter you, and you shall live ... and you shall know that I am the Lord" (37:4–6). Ezekiel does as commanded. The bones assemble in a great rattling and flesh covers them (37:7–8). Then he is told to prophesy to the wind to breathe into the bodies, and they come alive and stand up (37:9–10). The point of the vision is explained in 37:11–14. Israel is in despair, but God is preparing to renew His people. He will open their graves, raise them to life, and place them in the land so that they will know that He is the Lord.

Ezekiel is then called upon to act out a parable with two sticks (37:15–24). The sticks represent Judah and Israel, the divided nation. God promises to gather them from where they have been scattered, join them into one people, and place His servant David as shepherd over them. Furthermore, God says:

David my servant shall be their prince for ever. I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will bless them and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My dwelling shall be with them; and I will be their

198 Ibid., 29–30.

199 Ibid., 30.

200 Vawter and Hoppe note the transition in Ezek 33 from harsh criticism to comforting messages of hope in chapter 34; *A New Heart*, 148.

201 Klein, *Ezekiel*, 154.

202 Wevers, 277.

203 The phrase "as I live" occurs 16 times in Ezekiel.

God, and they shall be my people. Then the nations will know that I the Lord sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary is in the midst of them for evermore (37:25b–28).

The people that God makes alive He gathers, shepherds, dwells with, and sanctifies.

4.4 *Comparisons and Conclusions*

Numerous parallels between John and Ezekiel surface when these texts are compared. Like Jesus before the tomb where Lazarus had been four days in the grave without hope of recovery, so Ezekiel stands before the hopeless valley of dry bones. God (the Father) is the one who raises the dead but He works through His servant (Ezekiel or Jesus) who is referred to as “Son of man.”²⁰⁴ The one whom God sends (cf. Ezek 2:3, 37:7; John 5:23) does not speak on his own initiative but does the will of the one who sent him. Both Jesus and Ezekiel are careful to speak God’s words (John 5:30, Ezek 37:7) and the word gives life. The Lazarus who hears from the tomb and comes alive is prefigured by those who hear the voice of Ezekiel and those whom God promises to raise from their graves in Ezekiel. The dead hear the voice and live (Ezek 37:7, 10; John 5:25). In Ezekiel the shepherd comes to dwell with the people, in John he dwells with them but must give his life for them in order that they might live.²⁰⁵ In both John (10:16, 11:52) and Ezekiel (37:15–23) the scattered people are gathered into one flock.²⁰⁶ God acts in Ezekiel so that “you will know that I am the Lord” (37:7) and Jesus acts in John “for the glory of God” (11:40). And what could be a more natural precedent for “as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will” (John 5:21) than the Father giving life in Ezek 37?

Also included in Ezek 37 are themes of God’s dwelling with His people and giving them His Spirit, the people following His ordinances and observing His statutes, the cleansing and sanctification of Israel, and the establishment of a

204 Granted, the significance of “Son of man” in the Fourth Gospel for Jesus is profoundly different from what is found in Ezekiel, but the language is the same! It is an additional textual “echo.”

205 Admittedly, this parallel harks back to John 10, but it is the shepherd of John 10 who gathers his sheep together into one flock according to John 11:52.

206 It is to be granted that the idea of a great eschatological gathering of the people of God is not limited to Ezekiel. Talbert cites as background to this hope: Isa 11:12; 27:12–13; 43:5; 56:8; Jer 31:8, 10; 32:37; Ezek 11:17; 28:25; 34:13; 36:24; 39:28; Hosea 1:11; Micah 2:12–13; Zephaniah 3:20; and 2 Maccabees 1:27; 2:7, 18; *Reading John*, 177. It is most peculiar that he omits Ezek 37:21–22; a passage with close ties to the picture of resurrection found in John 11.

covenant of peace. Remarkably, these are themes of John 13–17. In John 14:2–3, 16–18, 21–23, and 27 the Evangelist speaks of God and His people dwelling together, the promise of the Spirit, His people keeping His commandments, and of peace that is given.²⁰⁷ In John 13:1–11 and 17:17–19 the themes of cleansing and sanctification come into view. Later on in John's Gospel Jesus will speak words of peace to them, breathe on them, and command them to receive the Spirit (John 20:21–22).

Chapter 37 of Ezekiel then seems to provide a wealth of material in terms of images, themes, and vocabulary that John takes up in chapters 5 and 11 and throughout the Fourth Gospel. This repetition of words, phrases, and themes has been called “volume”²⁰⁸ and it is difficult to understand why more commentators have not “heard” it. The claim of Jesus to be “the resurrection and the life,” followed by his raising of Lazarus, is likely intended by John as a sign that the new age of Israel's history prophesied by Ezekiel had dawned in the person of Jesus. It is doubtful that the Jews of the first century would have missed this connection. The messianic overtones of the sign, along with the growing popularity of Jesus, prompted the authorities' decision to destroy Jesus (John 11:47–53).²⁰⁹ If the 11th chapter of the Fourth Gospel is such an important chapter and its background can be traced to the 37th chapter of Ezekiel, it seems inappropriate to interpret the text without some consideration of that background.

When vocabulary study was broadened to examine larger figures and motifs, the presence of intertextual connections became more evident. The word “glory” became attached to the figure of a new Temple and similarities between John and Ezekiel emerged. Water and Spirit were connected with the image of a life-giving river flowing from the new Temple and the intertextual relationship became virtually undeniable. The Good Shepherd clearly draws from Ezekiel and these links help the reader to anticipate the intertextual link between John 5 and 11, and Ezek 37. The case for intertextuality appears strong for these points. Does the text support others? In light of these primary points of contact, certain secondary ones seem more plausible.

207 Chapter 14 echoes John 5 in numerous places. Compare 5:19–20, and 36 with 14:10–12; and compare 5:37–38, and 42 with 14:21–24.

208 Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 30.

209 Lindars, *John*, 405.

Secondary Points of Contact

Beyond the images of the preceding chapter for which evidence of Ezekiel's influence can be reasonably established, additional points of contact need to be explored. These are points for which intertextual relationships have been suggested, but where the evidence may be somewhat less extensive. The Johannine passages and topics discussed below have been associated, to one degree or another, with the prophecies of Ezekiel. It is our opinion that these may owe a certain debt, however slight, to Ezekiel's influence, though they may not be so clearly linked to the text. Hence, these are considered to be of a secondary nature.

1 Born of Water and Spirit

One of the best known interpretive problems in the Gospel of John is found in John 3:5 where Jesus tells Nicodemus that, “unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.”¹ The importance of the new birth is stressed in this first exposition on eternal life found in the Gospel.² A critical issue for interpretation is determining what is meant by “born of water and the Spirit.” Are two distinct births being suggested, or one birth with two distinct elements? Or is there any distinction between water and Spirit at all? Do the two blend and actually mean the same thing, or does the first merely qualify the second. Finally, is the reference to water to be considered a scribal gloss added to connect the passage with baptism?³ Numerous explanations have been given.

Seeing the reference as being to two distinct births in parallel with being born of flesh and Spirit in 3:6, some commentators explain 3:5 as physical birth

1 Zane C. Hodges, “Problematic Passages in the Gospel of John, Part 3: Water and Spirit—John 3:5,” *BibSac* 135 (1978), 206.

2 Ibid.

3 So Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 138–139. Rudolph Schnackenburg counters this argument by pointing out that, “Textual criticism provides no reason for doubting that they belonged to the original constitution of the Gospel”; *The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 1, trans. Kevin Smyth (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1990), 369.

(water) and spiritual birth (the Spirit).⁴ They recall the bag of fluid that surrounds the unborn child until the membrane is broken and the child is born “out of water.”⁵ A major difficulty with this interpretation is the unlikelihood that the connection between water and physical birth would have been made in the first century.⁶ Witherington appeals to Stol as having demonstrated that the Hebrew verb *HYL* (*halum* in Akkadian), usually translated “to give birth,” literally denotes the rupturing of the amniotic sack or membrane.⁷ But Old Testament parallels linking water with physical procreation (beyond this etymological note) remain lacking. Furthermore, there is a grammatical consideration that tends to point away from seeing “born of water and the Spirit” as two distinct acts. The two nouns (both anarthrous in Greek) are linked by a conjunction and preceded by a single preposition, ἐκ. This would tend to suggest a single birth with two aspects (or a blend of two ideas) rather than two separate births.⁸ It seems best to view the birth of water and Spirit in John 3 as “co-ordinate, correlative, [and] complementary.”⁹

Recognizing the significance of the grammatical construction (the single preposition used with two connected anarthrous nouns) some commentators combine water and Spirit into one idea. This appears to have been the approach of Origen¹⁰ and Calvin.¹¹ More recently Odeberg has connected water

4 Examples include Russell Fowler, “Born of Water and the Spirit (John 3:5),” *ExpTim* 82 (1971); D. G. Spriggs, “Meaning of Water in John 3:5,” *ExpTim* 85 (1974); and Ben Witherington, “The Waters of Birth: John 3:5 and 1 John 5:6–8,” *NTS* 35 (1989), 155–160, who traces the view back to R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1920), 93ff.

5 R. Fowler, “Born of Water,” 159; Spriggs, “Meaning of Water,” 150.

6 So Donald Guthrie, “John,” in *The New Bible Commentary: Revised*, eds. D. Guthrie and J. A. Motyer (Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1970), 936; and Hodges, “Water and Spirit,” 212.

7 Witherington, “Waters of Birth,” 158, where he refers to M. Stol’s study in *Zwangerschap in geboorte bij de Babyloniers in de Bijbel* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983), 59ff., as cited by Margaret Pamment, “John 3:5, ‘Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God,’” *NovT* 25 (1983), 189–190.

8 Ray Summers, “Born of Water and Spirit,” in *The Teacher’s Yoke: Studies in Memory of Henry Trantham* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1964), 117–128. Witherington counters this objection by citing a similar construction in 1 John 5:6 where he claims that the reference is to two distinct things; “Waters of Birth,” 159. J. Ramsey Michaels (*John*, 61) acknowledges that it is impossible to tell on the basis of grammatical considerations alone. In light of the absence of other substantiating evidence, the case for equating “born of water” with physical birth remains tenuous.

9 B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 108.

10 A. E. Brooke, ed., *Origen on the Gospel of John*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896), 249–250.

11 Calvin interprets “water and Spirit” to mean the same thing in the way that “Spirit and fire” are equated in the preaching of John the Baptist; John Calvin, *Commentary on the*

with natural birth, but not with the amniotic fluid of the womb, instead, with the male semen, and argues for a birth that is ἐκ σπέρματος πνευματικῆς (out of spiritual seed/semen) in contrast to physical birth.¹² Talbert paraphrases the expression as a hendiadys, “born of water which is Spirit.”¹³ Morris opts for “spiritual water” and sees it as merely another way to refer to being born of the Spirit.¹⁴ These interpretations are grammatically possible but fail to satisfy the apparent two-fold aspect of the new birth (or the birth from above).¹⁵

A common understanding of the phrase “born of water” is to see a reference to baptism: Christian baptism, John’s baptism, or both. The notion of Christian baptism is suggested by Dodd, Lindars, Haenchen, Marsh, and others.¹⁶ Some (Brown, Barrett, and Schnackenburg, for example) see Christian baptism as only a secondary reference, obvious to the original readers but subservient to the idea that the Spirit’s regeneration is primary.¹⁷ Still others (Westcott, Robertson, Tenney, Beasley-Murray, and Burge, to name a few), believe that John the Baptist’s baptism, a baptism with reference to repentance, is more in

Gospel According to John, vol. 1, *Calvin’s Commentaries*, trans. William Pringle (Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1949), 111.

- 12 Hugo Odeberg supports this claim by appealing to Rabbinic, Mandaean, and Hermetic sources; *The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World*, reprinted from a 1929 edition (Chicago: Argonaut Publishers, 1968), 48–71. But G. R. Beasley-Murray judges that this interpretation is hardly justified by the evidence cited by Odeberg; “John 3:3,5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom,” *ExpTim* 97 (1986), 168.
- 13 Charles Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (New York: Crossroads, 1992), 99.
- 14 Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1971), 218.
- 15 The ἀνωθεν of John 3:3 can mean either “again” or “from above.”
- 16 C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 309; Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (New Century Bible; Greenwood, S. C.: Oliphants, 1972), 152; Haenchen, *John*, vol. 1, 200; and John Marsh, *Saint John* (Westminster Pelican Commentaries; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 185. These authors see a strong sacramental influence in the Fourth Gospel and clearly see Christian baptism in view at John 3:5. Others, such as Robert Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1975), 259, hold that the Fourth Gospel is either anti-sacramental or a-sacramental (neither aware of nor practicing the sacraments). For a discussion of sacraments in the Fourth Gospel see G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Gospel of Life: Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1991), 85–101.
- 17 Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, vol. 29, Anchor Bible (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966), 142–143; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2nd. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 209; and Schnackenburg, *John*, 369–370.

focus.¹⁸ A direct allusion to Christian baptism is extremely difficult to accept due to the fact that Jesus expected Nicodemus to have understood his meaning (John 3:10). Brown provides the reminder that, “Nicodemus could have understood nothing of Christian Baptism or of the theology of rebirth associated with it.”¹⁹

To understand the direct implication of Jesus’ statement to Nicodemus, one must look into Nicodemus’ own background to discover what would have prepared him to understand Jesus’ words. Cotterell suggests three bases for reference: 1) Jewish proselyte baptism where the baptized proselyte was compared to a new-born child (supposedly to have taken hold in Judaism some time in the first century AD), 2) John’s baptism of repentance which was causing a great sensation in Israel at the time, and 3) the terminology found in the Old Testament and pseudepigraphic eschatology of passages such as Ezekiel 36:25–26, Isaiah 44:3ff, and Jubilees 1:23–25.²⁰

Of these, Ezekiel 36:25–27 is most interesting:

I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will take out of your flesh the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you and cause you to walk in my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances.

Ezekiel had been prophesying judgment to the children of Israel due to their gross sins and wickedness against God. But there was also a message of hope. God would renew His people and give them a new kind of life that would enable them to walk with Him. The new life He would give would come about through two key elements—a metaphorical cleansing of water and the infusion of God’s spirit into their lives. It would prepare them for the return of God’s glory to the new Temple where He would dwell with them forever.

18 Westcott, *John*, 108; A. T. Robertson, “The Fourth Gospel,” vol. 5, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1932), 46; Merrill C. Tenney, “The Gospel of John,” *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 9 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 47; Beasley-Murray, “John 3:3, 5,” 168; and Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 162–163.

19 Brown, *John*, 142.

20 F. Cotterell, “The Nicodemus Conversation: A Fresh Appraisal,” *ExpTim* 96 (1985), 240–241. We agree and believe the text in Ezekiel provided the primary field of reference for Nicodemus. For Isaiah 44:3 to be included is no surprise due to the influence that Ezekiel had on Exilic Isaiah, particularly in the language of the new covenant. See Eakins, 177–178.

Belleville has concluded that the “birth of water and Spirit” that Jesus expected Nicodemus to recognize was this cleansing of water and regenerating gift of the Spirit promised in Ezekiel 36.²¹ Though not all have given the Ezekiel passage the same prominence, several other commentators also recall Ezekiel 36 as providing some explanation of Jesus’ statement in John 3:5.²² In light of the way this Old Testament passage echoes such close verbal similarities, satisfies the grammatical implications of a single experience with two aspects, and would have been both available and understandable to Nicodemus as a teacher of the Jews, it is not too difficult to believe that it had an important role in the background to John 3:5.²³

If this is true, it is possible to deny any direct allusion to Christian baptism.²⁴ Such a conclusion would be consistent with Kysar’s assessment that the Fourth Evangelist is a-sacramental in outlook.²⁵ Furthermore, the appeal to physical birth is rendered superfluous. Being “born of water” does not correspond with “that which is born of the flesh is flesh” in 3:6 but with “unless one is born anew (or, from above)” in 3:3 as one aspect of that new birth. Being born of “water and Spirit” was something promised by Ezekiel and it is entirely possible that Jesus intended Nicodemus to recognize such a promise as the intelligible explanation to being “born anew.”²⁶ Nicodemus missed the connection

21 Linda Belleville discusses the possibilities at length and arrives at this conclusion in “Born of Water and Spirit: John 3:5,” *TrinJ* 1 (1980), 125–141.

22 Examples include Barrett, *John*, 208; Beasley-Murray, “John 3:3, 5,” 168–169; Brown, *John*, 140; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 162; Cotterell, “Nicodemus,” 241; Lindars, *John*, 152; and Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 370. Hodges, “Water and Spirit,” 206–220, ignores Ezekiel 36 but refers to Ezekiel 37 in his theory that the passage should be translated “born of water (referring to God’s promise to pour out water on the thirsty, Isaiah 44:3) and wind (referring to the wind of God’s Spirit in the valley of dry bones, Ezekiel 37:9–10).” The translation is possible, but unconvincing. Still, the appeal to Ezekiel points to close ties between Ezekiel and John.

23 This is not to deny that Jubilees 1:23ff. could have contributed to Nicodemus’ understanding of being “born of water and the Spirit.” In Jubilees God creates a holy spirit within His people, cleanses them, and makes them His children; so Brown, *John*, 140. John appears to draw from multiple traditions in his Jewish heritage. In addition, it is entirely possible that the author of Jubilees is somewhat dependent upon Ezekiel as Exilic Isaiah was previously.

24 However, accepting Ezek 36 as background to John 3:5 does not rule out the possibility of a connection with *John’s* baptism; Beasley-Murray, “John 3:3, 5,” 168. It may provide for further understanding of John the Baptist’s ministry as one who baptizes with water (John 1:26) but who awaits one greater who will baptize with the Holy Spirit (John 1:33).

25 Kysar, *Fourth Evangelist*, 259.

26 It is also possible to reach this conclusion based upon the Old Testament’s use of water to refer to cleansing and spirit to refer to renewal; Lev 11:32; 14:8–9; Num 19:12–19; Isa 4:4; 44:3; Zech 13:1; Joel 2:28–29.

and failed to understand the point of Jesus. The modern reader is urged not to make the same mistake.

2 Son of Man

The origin and meaning of the Son of Man sayings in the Fourth Gospel has been a major puzzle for Johannine scholars.²⁷ Scholars have tended to trace the origin of the Son of Man idea to Psalm 80:17,²⁸ Daniel 7:13–14,²⁹ Wisdom literature,³⁰ or Gnostic sources.³¹ However, a few are inclined to include Ezekiel as a significant influence.³² Sidebottom protests:

It is hard to see why writers so consistently ignore or minimize the influence of the Son of Man in Ezekiel on the New Testament usage. Only here in pre-Christian literature is the expression certainly a title; it occurs about a hundred times in all, six times as many as in the rest of the Old Testament.³³

Borgen has proposed three elements forming the background of the Johannine Son of Man: 1) the apocalyptic Son of Man of Dan 7:13–14; 2) the human figure in the Merkabah passage of Ezek 1:26; and 3) a Christian re-interpretation of the term “Son of Man.”³⁴ The subject is too vast to investigate in detail here but consideration must be given to the possibility that Ezekiel may have contributed something to the Son of Man in John.

²⁷ John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 337.

²⁸ Dodd, *Interpretation*, 245. Dodd believes that Psalm 80 takes precedence over Daniel 7.

²⁹ Ashton: “The remote origin of all the sayings is the Danielic Son of Man,” *Understanding*, 340. Ashton believes that John drew from the Synoptic traditions of the Son of Man sayings as well; *ibid.*, 340–341.

³⁰ Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 1, 541; and F. M. Braun, “Messie, Logos et Fils de L’Homme,” in *La Venue de Jean* (Recherches Bibliques 6; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1962), 133–147.

³¹ This is the conclusion of Wayne Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 297; but Charles H. Talbert refutes this idea in “Myth of a Descending-Ascending Redeemer in Mediterranean Antiquity,” *NTS* 22 (1976), 418–440.

³² Examples include: E. M. Sidebottom, “The Son of Man as Man in the Fourth Gospel,” *ExpTim* 68 (1956), 231–235, 280–283; Jens Christensen, “Le Fils de l’Homme s’en va, ainsi qu’il est écrit de lui,” *Studia Theologica* 10 (1957), 28–39; Eduard Schweizer, “The Son of Man Again,” *NTS* 9 (1963), 256; Bruce Vawter, “Ezekiel and John,” *CBQ* 26 (1964), 450–458; and Peder Borgen, *Bread From Heaven* (SupNovTest 10; Leiden: Brill, 1965), 186.

³³ Sidebottom, “Son of Man,” 233.

³⁴ Borgen, *Bread From Heaven*, 186.

The term “Son of Man” occurs some 87 times in the Book of Ezekiel as the title given to Ezekiel by God; he is always addressed as “Son of Man.”³⁵ In John’s Gospel, “Son of Man” is the self-designation of Jesus and the only title that he ever applied to himself.³⁶ Numerous parallels have been observed between the Son of Man in Ezekiel and Jesus, the Son of Man.³⁷ The Son of Man in Ezekiel stands in the presence of God and is sent to reveal God’s glory (2:1–3:4). He is a paradigm of obedience to the will of God in the midst of a rebellious people (2:8). He is filled with the word of God (3:1–4) and the Spirit of God (2:1; 3:24–25; 11:4–5). He lives among those who have eyes to see and yet do not see, ears to hear and yet do not hear (12:2), who talk about him and run after him, and yet do not do what he says (33:30–32). He expresses his message through symbolic acts and signs, and is himself a sign to Israel by means of his difficulties, privation, and suffering (4:9ff.; 5:1ff.; 12:6, 11, 17ff.; 21:11, 17; and 24:24). He speaks in parables (20:49). He identifies himself with the people of Israel and sees their destiny in his own experiences (4:4–15; 12:1–7, 17–20; 24:15–24). He is the judge of Israel (20:4ff.; 22:1ff.) providing a judgment that is effected through his words and his works, one which is both present and yet to come (21:12). He knows some cannot hear his word (3:27). He is spiritually stirred and discomforted, he groans, and his soul is troubled (3:14–15; 21:11). The burden of his ministry is that “they may know I am the Lord.” He announces the coming of the Good Shepherd (34:23ff.), the eschatological purification of God’s people (36:17, 25ff.), the resurrection of the dead (37:1–14), and a covenant of peace which includes a divine pledge to dwell with the people forever (37:24–28). He denounces the profanation of the Temple and proclaims a new one from whence rivers of water will flow (8:1ff.; 40–48). Brownlee would add to these the observation that Jesus’ knowledge of the occurrence of Lazarus’ death is like that of Ezekiel’s knowledge of the destruction of the Temple (24:25–27; 33:31–32).³⁸ The resemblance of these parallels to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is striking.

35 Schweizer, “Son of Man,” 256.

36 Oscar Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament*, trans. Shirley Guthrie and Charles Hall (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), 137.

37 The examples here are a composite of those provided by Vawter, “Ezekiel and John,” 452–453; and Schweizer, “Son of Man,” 256. Vawter acknowledges an indebtedness to William A. Curtis, *Jesus Christ the Teacher: A Study of His Method and Message Based Mainly upon the Earlier Gospels* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), 137–140.

38 William H. Brownlee, “Whence the Gospel According to John?” In *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd rev. ed., ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1990), 168.

Would John pattern his presentation of Jesus after the figure of Ezekiel? It is possible in light of the way that the Fourth Gospel seems to reflect Moses and Exodus typology as well.³⁹ Many scholars perceive a conscious effort in the Gospel to present Jesus as a new Moses, and provide parallels with Moses' ministry in a manner similar to what Vawter and Schweizer have done with Ezekiel.⁴⁰ The problem is that Ezekiel does not command the same sense of importance for Judaism as Moses. Still, the multitudinous parallels are difficult to ignore.

Fuller has demonstrated that the Son of Man figure in Ezekiel is inadequate to explain the richness of meaning attached to the Son of Man figure in the New Testament.⁴¹ But it would be wrong to conclude from Fuller's investigation that Ezekiel had no influence on the Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel.⁴² Dodd has commented that "John has deliberately moulded the idea of the Son of God ... upon the prophetic model."⁴³ The same could be said for the Son of Man in John and Sidebottom is convinced that "Ezekiel was one of the sitters for the composite portrait."⁴⁴

If Ezekiel could be linked with the Son of Man concept in the Fourth Gospel, it might explain the unusual construction of "Son of Man" in John 5:27. John routinely uses "υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου" but in 5:27 he has "υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου."⁴⁵ In that context⁴⁶ John is presenting the Son of Man in the prophetic role of judge, a role missing in Daniel's scene but present with the Ezekielian Son of Man who, like Jesus in John 5:24–29, confronts Israel with the word of God as judge.⁴⁷ Vawter believes that John has used the formula of Ezekiel because in this passage he has cast Jesus in the same role as Ezekiel.⁴⁸ It seems hard to disagree with Stalker's position when he claims that the Son of Man

39 Thomas F. Glasson has proposed that the story of Moses and the Exodus is prominent in the Fourth Gospel and comprises a dominant motif in John's thought; *Moses in the Fourth Gospel* (Studies in Biblical Theology 40; London: SCM Press, 1963).

40 Examples include Glasson, *ibid.*; Jacob J. Enz, "The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John," *JBL* 76 (1957), 208–215; and Robert H. Smith, "Exodus Typology in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 81 (1962), 329–342.

41 Reginald Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus: An Examination of the Presuppositions of New Testament Theology* (Studies in Biblical Theology 12; Chicago: A. R. Allenson, Publisher, 1954), 95–108.

42 Vawter, "Ezekiel and John," 451.

43 Dodd, *Interpretation*, 255.

44 Sidebottom, *Christ of the Fourth Gospel*, 78.

45 Vawter, "Ezekiel and John," 454.

46 A context with strong links to Ezek 37.

47 Vawter, "Ezekiel and John," 454.

48 *Ibid.*

title owes “something” to Ezekiel as well as Daniel and Enoch.⁴⁹ But the exact nature of that “something” remains a mystery.

3 Paraclete

The designation of the Holy Spirit as Paraclete is a distinctively Johannine contribution.⁵⁰ That is a point at which there is basic agreement among scholars. The exact nature of and background for the Paraclete, however, are matters over which there is much disagreement.⁵¹ Two of the questions that arise in the discussions are: 1) What is the nature of the Paraclete, personal or impersonal?⁵² and 2) Whence the idea of the Paraclete? For the purposes of this work, the latter question will be in focus.

The History of Religions School (especially Bauer, Windisch, Bultmann, and Becker) attempted to find the origins of the Paraclete in the proto-Mandaean Gnostic literature, a theory with serious inadequacies for proof.⁵³ Brown, however, based upon the investigations of Mowinkel,⁵⁴ Johansson,⁵⁵ Cross,⁵⁶ and Betz⁵⁷ into Jewish backgrounds, has proposed that Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel is best understood in light of a background in: 1) the tandem relationships of Moses/Joshua and Elijah/Elisha; 2) the concept of the spirit of God

49 D. M. G. Stalker, *Ezekiel* (Torch Bible Commentaries; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1968), 41.

50 Raymond E. Brown, “The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel,” *NTS* 13 (1967), 113. Brown claims that the term is used in five passages. Actually it is found only in four (14:15–17, 26; 15:26–27; and 16:7–11), but “the Spirit of Truth” is equated with the Paraclete in 14:16–17 and therefore 16:13–15 is taken by Brown as a Paraclete passage.

51 Stephen S. Smalley, *John, Evangelist and Interpreter* (Greenwood: Attic Press, 1978), 228.

52 A proponent of the Paraclete being an impersonal divine power is George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), especially 52–58. The Paraclete is presented in completely personal terms by Brown, “Paraclete,” 113–132. Otto Betz argues for a combination of personal successor to Jesus, and a heavenly power in *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), 159–164.

53 Brown, “Paraclete,” 119.

54 Sigmund Mowinkel, “Die Vorstellungen des Spätjudentums vom heiligen Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet,” *ZNW* 32 (1933), 97–130.

55 Nils Johansson, *Parakletoi: Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der Alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1940).

56 Frank M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, revised ed. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961), 213–215.

57 Betz, *Der Paraklet*, 128–130.

coming upon the prophets that they might speak the words of God; and 3) late Jewish angelology.⁵⁸

Vawter has argued for a connection between the Johannine Paraclete and the prophet Ezekiel.⁵⁹ He basically contends that the ministry of the Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel is a combination of both prophetic and priestly roles.⁶⁰ He then raises the question of which Old Testament prophetic figure includes a priestly character that can best qualify as the type for the Johannine Paraclete.⁶¹ His handy answer is Ezekiel, the exiled priest turned prophet.⁶² Vawter then includes a few parallels of the priestly nature of Ezekiel's work to the ministry of Jesus.⁶³ Supposedly a comparison with Jesus is to be equated with a parallel to the Paraclete because the Paraclete is another just like Jesus!⁶⁴

It is an extremely arduous task to go from the evidence that Vawter provides to a conclusion that John owes a debt to Ezekiel in regard to the idea of the Paraclete. However, Ezekiel does have a strong emphasis on the Spirit in his prophecies, and parallels can be drawn between his ministry and that of the Paraclete in John.⁶⁵ He is sent from God, does not speak on his own authority, and what he hears he speaks (3:4–11). He takes the things of God and shares them with his people. He bears witness to God. He declares things to come and he prophesies against the sins of the nations with reference to judgment. He calls into remembrance Israel's history (16:22, 43), God's covenant (16:60–63), and the evil ways of the people (36:31). He cannot be with the people forever, but God will provide a prince who will dwell with them forever (37:25). The spirit comes from God, but Ezekiel can speak to the spirit and it comes upon dry bones at his command (37:9–10). Of course, the parallels are not exact. The world can and does see Ezekiel in contrast to the Paraclete who remains invisible. The language of "truth" is missing in Ezekiel, and Ezekiel is not said to "glorify" God (though his ministry does have that effect).

Does John draw from Ezekiel for the Paraclete? Perhaps, but it is more likely that Brown's threefold explanation is nearer the mark, and Ezekiel is to

58 Brown, "Paraclete," 120–121.

59 Vawter, "Ezekiel and John," 455–458.

60 Ibid., 456–457.

61 Ibid., 457.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid., 458.

64 Ibid., 456.

65 Johannine passages pertinent for comparison are found in John 14:15–17, 26; 15:26–27; and 16:7–11. These parallels are our own observations and not provided elsewhere in the literature on the Fourth Gospel. It is interesting that Ezekiel's ministry has striking parallels to both the Son of Man *and* the Paraclete of John. But that is no surprise given the fact that the Paraclete continues the ministry of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.

be included as one of many prophets on whom God's spirit has come in order that they might speak the words of God to men. Vawter's evidence for a connection appears inadequate. If a connection exists it must be demonstrated on different grounds.

4 "Die in Your Sins"

In John 8:21, 24 Jesus gives warning to the Jewish leaders: "you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he."⁶⁶ Guthrie has proposed that this phrase, "die in your sin," may have derived from the LXX of Ezekiel 3:20, where the man who is not warned will "die in his sin."⁶⁷ The verbal similarity is interesting. Jesus is certainly giving warning in the text as Ezekiel does in the Old Testament. Unfortunately, the watchman image is not vividly expressed in the Fourth Gospel. This may be a case of incidental correspondence.

5 "I Have Glorified It" [My Name]

When Andrew and Philip approach Jesus in John 12 they come with news that some Greeks have arrived and have requested an audience with him. Jesus' response is charged with gravity: "The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified" (12:23). Somehow, the arrival of the Greeks to see Jesus points also to the arrival of his "hour." With an ominous sense of what lies ahead, he first raises a question, then answers it, and finally presents a request to God: "What shall I say? 'Father, save me from this hour'? No, for this purpose I have come to this hour. Father, glorify thy name" (12:27–28). The obedience of the Son to fulfill the Father's will is settled.⁶⁸ He will not shrink back. Then a voice comes from heaven, "I have both glorified it, and I will glorify it again" (12:28). The Father has all along been giving the Son signs of His closeness and involvement (8:16, 29, 54); now the Father assures the Son that He will exalt him and vindicate him in the ordeal to come.⁶⁹

In the promise to glorify His name, there may be an echo of Ezekiel 36:23 and 38:23.⁷⁰ In Ezekiel, God promises:

66 Or "that *I am*" (ἐγώ εἰμι in Greek).

67 Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, 193.

68 Schnackenburg, *John*, vol. 2, 387.

69 Ibid., 388.

70 Ibid.

And I will vindicate the holiness of my great name, which has been profaned among the nations, and which you have profaned among them; and the nations will know that I am the Lord, says the Lord God, when through you I vindicate my holiness before their eyes (36:23).

.....

So I will show my greatness and my holiness and make myself known in the eyes of many nations. Then they will know that I am the Lord (38:23).

Notice the parallels between John and Ezekiel. The nations (Greeks) appear in both contexts. God will make Himself known among the nations and Jesus will draw all men unto himself. The term “Son of man” appears in both texts. A voice from heaven that sounds like thunder (John 12:28–29) can be heard in Ezekiel as well (1:24–25). Throughout the Gospel Jesus shows concern for the name of God (5:43; 10:25) as does Ezekiel in his prophecies. Are these all to be taken as mere coincidence, or does John’s language betray a close familiarity with Ezekiel?

6 The Christ Remains Forever

In 12:32 Jesus makes reference to his “being lifted up” and John supplies the explanation that this was said in order to show what death he was to die (12:33). For John the statement points to the crucifixion and exaltation of Jesus, but for the people it was likely understood as a reference to a departure from the earth, the end of his earthly ministry.⁷¹ The crowd, those who are open to the possibility of believing but still undecided in the Fourth Gospel,⁷² protests: “We have heard from the law that the Christ [Messiah] remains for ever. How can you say that the Son of man must be lifted up?”

Of interest here is the scripture citation to which they refer—where does the law make this pronouncement? Such an explicit statement is not made in the Old Testament as a whole and certainly not in the Pentateuch.⁷³ Dodd is convinced that “John 12:34 must refer to prophetic passages such as Isaiah 9:6–7 and Ezekiel 37:25,” even though they are cited as Torah.⁷⁴ Cooke, commenting

⁷¹ Ibid., 394.

⁷² R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 131–132.

⁷³ Henry M. Shires, *Finding the Old Testament in the New* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 20.

⁷⁴ Dodd, *Interpretation*, 78. Brown adds Psalm 89:4, 36; 110:4; Daniel 7:14; *John*, 469.

on Ezekiel 37:25 in his commentary, concurs: “This passage is probably one of those alluded to in John 12:34.”⁷⁵ The text reads:

They shall dwell in the land where your fathers dwelt that I gave to my servant Jacob; they and their children and their children’s children shall dwell there forever; and David my servant shall be their prince forever.

If John is not making reference to some sort of composite passage here, then Ezek 37:25 would be an excellent choice as it includes both “dwelling” and “forever” in the context.

7 I Will Do It

Twice in the Fourth Gospel Jesus promises that whatever is asked in his name—“I will do it” (John 14:13–14). This resolute promise on the lips of Jesus in the Gospel sounds remarkably like the promises of God in Ezekiel (17:24; 22:15; 24:14; 36:36), “I, the Lord, have spoken and I will do it.”⁷⁶ Only one other Old Testament passage is similar—“I have spoken and I will bring it to pass; I have purposed and I will do it” (Isaiah 46:3), and it is possible that Isaiah is demonstrating influence by Ezekiel at this point.⁷⁷ Furthermore, in John 14:14 the purpose is “that the Father may be glorified in the Son”; while in Ezekiel 36:36 it is so “that the nations that are left around about you will know that I the Lord have rebuilt the ruined places, and replanted that which was desolate.” The theme of God’s glory is connected to both contexts. It seems possible that John has recalled the promise formula of God from the prophecies of Ezekiel to add veracity to the promise of Jesus in the Gospel.⁷⁸

75 G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*, International Critical Commentary, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), 403.

76 One slight variation to this formula occurs in 24:14 where the text reads, “I, the Lord, have spoken; it shall come to pass, I will do it”.

77 Eakins has argued that Exilic Isaiah was likely influenced by Ezekiel; “Ezekiel’s Influence on the Exilic Isaiah,” 153, 195. These passages might be further evidence of that conclusion though they are not cited in the study.

78 We know of no commentators who have observed this possible point of intertextuality. It became evident while comparing the theological vocabularies.

8 The True Vine

One of the great “I am” sayings of Jesus is his claim to be the True Vine in John 15:1. Ladd contends that the vine imagery reflects a familiar Old Testament idiom of Israel as God’s vineyard.⁷⁹ Although Bultmann would deny an Old Testament-Jewish background to the vine image in favor of Gnostic sources,⁸⁰ there seems to be ample evidence that the vine had long served as an emblem of the chosen people of God in Jewish literature.⁸¹ Scriptures that support the image are Psalm 80:8; Jeremiah 2:21; Hosea 10:1; Ezekiel 15:2–6, 17:1–10, 19:10; and Isaiah 5:1–7, 27:2–3.⁸² Isaiah 5:7 (“The vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel”) and Hosea 10:1 (“Israel is a luxuriant vine”) probably stand closer to the True Vine of John 15 than Ezekiel as a picture of the people of God. Closer still would be Jeremiah 2:21 where God complains that He has planted a choice vine which has turned degenerate. Jesus, by contrast, is the *True* Vine of God.⁸³

The issue in Ezek 15 is not the genuineness of the vine, but its usefulness. But this issue surfaces in John as well. The branch that does not produce fruit, the one that is useless because it does not abide in the vine, is cast into the fire (15:1–6). In Ezekiel, the conclusion is that the “vine branch” is “useful for nothing” and how much less when “the fire has consumed it” (15:1–5). Later, in 17:1–10, Ezekiel tells the “parable” (17:2) of the eagle that plants a “vine” which sends forth “branches” and “bears fruit” (17:7–8), but because the vine has provoked God (17:12), its shoots “shall be dried up” (17:9).⁸⁴ The similar vocabulary found in John 15:1–6 seems too close to deny that a familiarity with the language in Ezekiel is being reflected. Furthermore, one should not overlook the fact that the notions of being “clean” and “abiding” (dwelling) in John 15 are prominent Ezekielian themes as well. It appears that John has blended a number of Old Testament passages related to vine imagery in presenting Jesus as the True Vine.

79 George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1974), 240.

80 Bultmann, *John*, 530.

81 W. H. Cadman, *The Open Heaven*, ed. G. B. Caird (New York: Herder and Herder, 1979), 175.

82 Paul S. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), 271.

83 John Painter, “The Church and Israel in the Gospel of John: A Response,” *NTS* 25 (1978), 112.

84 Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John’s Prologue* (JSNTS 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 37.

9 The One Hundred Fifty-Three Fish

Perhaps the most interesting (ingenious?) link which commentators have proposed between Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel is the reference to the 153 fish in John 21:11.⁸⁵ The context has the post-resurrection Jesus guiding a fishing expedition of the disciples from the shore (21:1–11). They have toiled all night and caught nothing, but at his command they cast out and take in a great catch of 153 large fish.

The primary discussion over this passage has centered on the meaning of 153. Is the number simply a detail of the story recorded without further significance, or does it have a symbolic meaning that must be deciphered? Brown argues for it being a simple recording of the number of fish caught:

We have no evidence that any such complicated understanding of 153 would have been intelligible to John's readers. We know of no speculation or established symbolism related to the number 153 in early thought. On the principle that where there is smoke there is fire, we would concede to the above-mentioned interpretations the likelihood that the number may be meant to symbolize the breadth or even the universality of the Christian mission. But we are inclined to think that because this symbolism is not immediately evident, it did not prompt the invention of the number; ... here perhaps we are to think of his [the Beloved Disciple's] reporting the exact number of fish that the disciples caught. The number would have been retained in the story because it was so large; and when the account received a symbolic interpretation, the number would have been interpreted as a figurative indication of the magnitude of the results from the disciple's mission.⁸⁶

85 The amount of literature that has been generated seeking to explain this obscure notation is nothing short of amazing. Two classic examples are J. A. Emerton, "The Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes in John XXI.11," *JTS* 9 (1958), 86–88; and Heinz Kruse, "Magni Pisces Centum Quinquaginta Tres," *Verbum Domini* 38 (1960), 129–148. Some more recent examples are Neil J. McEleney, "153 Great Fishes (John 21:11)—Gematriacal Atbash," *Biblica*, 58 (1977), 411–417; Joseph A. Romeo, "Gematria and John 21:11—The Children of God," *JBL* 97 (1978), 263–264; Bruce H. Grigsby, "Gematria and John 21:11—Another Look at Ezekiel 47:10," *ET* 95 (1984), 177–178; Paul Trudinger, "The 153 Fishes: A Response and a Further Suggestion," *ET* 102 (1990), 11–12; Kenneth Cardwell, "The Fish on the Fire: John 21:9," *ET* 102 (1990), 12–14; and Antonio Pitta, "*Ichthys ed opsarion* in Gv 21:1–14: semplice variazione lessicale o differenza con valore simbolico?" *Biblica* 71 (1990), 348–364. Of the above, only McEleney, Owens, and Cardwell fail to recognize a connection with Ezekiel in their explanations of the puzzle.

86 Brown, *John*, 1075–1076.

But would John have recorded the number if it had no significance for him beyond the simple detail of it? John is given to *double entendre*—"it was winter" when Jesus walked in the Temple portico (10:23), when Jesus is "lifted up" he will draw all men unto him (12:32), and when Judas went out "it was night" (13:30). The Gospel also gives evidence that John pays attention to numbers—he has seven "I am" sayings, seven signs, seven discourses, six waterpots and a seventh source (2:6–8), seven similes, seven days at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and seven scenes in the trial narrative.⁸⁷ However, not all numbers seem to have special meaning—five porches at the pool, a 38-year-old man, or the five husbands of a Samaritan woman. Still, it would be in keeping with John's style to have a symbolic reference here.

If it is symbolic,⁸⁸ what is the clue to unlocking its symbolism? An early attempt to solve the riddle was offered by Jerome⁸⁹ in his commentary on the text of Ezekiel 47:9–10 which reads:

And wherever the river goes every living creature which swarms will live, and there will be very many fish; for this water goes there.... Fishermen will stand beside the sea; from En-gedi to En-eglaim it will be a place for the spreading of nets; its fish will be of very many kinds, like the fish of the Great Sea.

Jerome related this passage to John 21:11 and quoted a piece of "scientific" information to the effect that there were 153 different species of fish.⁹⁰ He went on to explain that one of each kind was caught in John to symbolize the universality of the Gospel. Barclay feels that this is an attractive solution but one that will hardly stand up to scrutiny. It is far more likely that Jerome is interpreting zoology from the scriptures rather than interpreting the scriptures from zoology.⁹¹

Other explanations have been offered based upon numerical decoding. Kruse has proposed two suggestions: "the church of love," or "the children of God."⁹² McEleney uses a technique of gematriacal atbash to conclude that 153 stands for the Greek letters ιχθ, a cryptic method of saying Ἰησοῦς Χριστός

87 Brown provides several sevens; *ibid.*, CXLII, 105–106, 597, 858.

88 Bultmann insists that it must have an allegorical meaning; *John*, 708–709.

89 This point of Jerome's has been reported by William Barclay, *Introduction to John and the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), 187; and by several other commentators.

90 *Ibid.*

91 *Ibid.*

92 Kruse, "Magni Pisces," 143–147.

Θεός, Jesus Christ is God.⁹³ Romeo, like Kruse, decodes 153 to mean “children of God” and relates the passage to the ingathering found in both John 11:52 and Ezekiel 34:11–16.⁹⁴ Owens denies an allusion to Ezekiel and claims a connection with Moses typology. The numeral 153 stands for Pisgah, the place of Moses’ departure when Joshua took over leadership of God’s people, as Peter and the other disciples will do when Jesus leaves.⁹⁵ All of these are interesting but none is entirely convincing.⁹⁶

One of the suggestions that seems to be taken more seriously in literature on this passage is that published by Emerton.⁹⁷ Based upon his numerical deciphering that yields numerical values for place sites in Ezekiel, Gedi = 17 and Eglaim = 153 (and the two numbers being related in that 153 is the triangular number of 17), he proposes that John 21:11 is an allusion to Ezekiel 47:8–10.⁹⁸ During the eschatological age described in Ezekiel, fishermen were to spread their nets from En-gedi to En-eglam and catch “very many kinds” of fish from the sea that teemed with life because water flowed into it from the sanctuary. In John the fishermen cast their nets along the sea of Galilee and take in a great catch of “large fish.” If John understood Ezekiel 47:8 to be a reference to Galilee, as Emerton believes is possible, he could have connected the Ezekiel passage with the story of Jesus by the sea.⁹⁹ According to Grigsby, the Evangelist could have intended his readers to recall the fishing villages of Ezekiel’s vision through the interpretive device of *gematria*.¹⁰⁰ The suggestion that John might have associated Ezekiel’s vision with Galilee was thought improbable and incorrect until the discovery of a rabbinic tradition that describes the river from Ezekiel’s Temple as flowing north to the sea of Tiberias rather than to the Dead Sea as the Masoretic Text implies.¹⁰¹ Did John see a reference to Ezekiel in the great catch by the sea? Apparently some early artist did. Daniélou recalls a

93 McEleney, “153 Great Fish,” 414–415.

94 Romeo, “Gematria and John 21,” 264.

95 Owens, “One Hundred and Fifty Three Fishes,” 53.

96 Sandra M. Schneiders, “John 21:1–14,” *Interpretation* 43 (1989), 72.

97 Emerton’s 1958 article, “The Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes,” has been defended and expanded by Grigsby (“Gematria and John 21”) in 1984 and again by Trudinger (“The 153 Fishes”) in 1990. Pitta follows Emerton as well and believes that Ezekiel 47:1–12 constitutes the fundamental background for the passage in John; “*Ichthys ed opsarion*,” 361. No other theory seems so resilient to criticism.

98 Emerton, “The Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes,” 86–88. Emerton has justified dropping the “En” prefix in arriving at these numbers due to the fact that it means “spring” and is not an essential part of the proper names in Ezekiel; 87–88.

99 Ibid.

100 Grigsby, “Gematria and John 21:11,” 178.

101 Ibid. This tradition is particularly interesting because it uses the term Tiberias rather than Galilee, the term for the sea in the rest of the New Testament but which is replaced by Tiberias in John 6:1 and 21:11.

painting from the early Christian period where the artist portrays Peter and John (whom tradition sees as being present in John 21) next to the stream of water that flows from [Ezekiel's] the Temple.¹⁰² If John did not make the connection, it seems that someone else did early in church history.

Of all the explanations, Emerton's has fewer problems and reflects an interest that John has shown elsewhere in the Temple vision of Ezekiel. Still, the symbolism of 153 fish, if any, remains obscure. Until more evidence is forthcoming, the verdict will have to remain pending.

10 Conclusion

This section has not been exhaustive of all the possible links with Ezekiel that have been suggested in the literature on the Fourth Gospel, but they represent points where a connection is plausible.¹⁰³ The presence of Ezekiel's influence elsewhere adds to the credibility that these may be a result of that influence as well. From these examples it seems that Ezekiel provides the background to a number of brief ideas and phrases throughout the Gospel of John as well as some of the major themes.

102 Jean Daniélou, *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne* (Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1966), 136. Daniélou draws attention to the association of Ezekiel with Johannine texts by early Christianity in his discussion of the symbols of "The Living Water and the Fish" in *Primitive Christian Symbols*, trans. Donald Attwater (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964), 42–57. He claims that the themes of the living water and the fish "are in prolongation of Ezekiel's words"; *ibid.*, 50.

103 For example, one of the most compelling recent cases made for John's allusion to Ezekiel can be found in Maarten J. J. Menken, "What Authority does the Fourth Evangelist claim for his Book?", in *Paul, John, and Apocalyptic Eschatology: Studies in Honour of Martinus C. DeBoer*, ed. J. Krans (NovTestSup 149, Leiden: Brill, 2013), 186–202. He writes (p. 197), "There is in the LXX one book whose ending literally corresponds to the first ending of John's Gospel in 20:31, and that is Ezekiel. The second half of Ezek 48:35 reads: καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως, ἅφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας γένηται, ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς, translated in NETS (Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2007], 985) as: 'And the name of the city: after whatever day it comes to be, it shall be its name.' The Hebrew text reads: הַמֶּשׁ הוּא־יְהוָה מֵיּוֹם רִיעָה־בִּשְׁמוֹ 'And the name of the city from that time on shall be, The Lord is there.' The LXX translator has apparently read the divine name as the verbal form יהיה, and the final word המש as the substantive שם with a third person singular feminine suffix. The result is that the LXX version of Ezekiel ends with τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς, while John 20:31 ends with τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Apart from the case of ὄνομα and the gender of the possessive pronoun the wordings are identical. An allusion to Ezekiel would not be surprising given the fact that John obviously knows the book of Ezekiel (see, e.g., Jesus' shepherd discourse in John 10, which was heavily influenced by Ezek 34, or his discourse on the vine and the branches in John 15:1–10, influenced by Ezek 15:1–8)."

Conclusion

The question from the beginning has been—Is Ezekiel to be considered a significant influence on the Fourth Gospel's presentation of Jesus? It is assumed that the text must bear evidence of intertextual links with Ezekiel to substantiate this influence. Does the Gospel echo the prophet, and what do these echoes, if any, mean for the interpretation of the Gospel?

1 Hays' Criteria and Evidence of Intertextuality

The application of Hay's criteria for identifying and interpreting intertextual echoes are helpful for evaluating the evidence of intertextuality.¹ While these were developed for Pauline studies, they are adapted here to appraise the intertextual echoes of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel.

1.1 *Availability*

Was the text of Ezekiel available to the author and readers of the Fourth Gospel? Given the abundant evidence of the author's acquaintance with the Old Testament as a whole,² and the accessibility of the Old Testament in the first century in both Hebrew and Greek, and the broad textual evidence that Ezekiel had an established place in the canon of the Old Testament, it can be considered certain that the text of Ezekiel was available to John at the time the Gospel was written.³ As for his readers, the same accessibility can be assumed. There is also ample evidence that early Christianity looked to the Old Testament traditions as witnesses to Jesus and interpreted them in that light.⁴

1.2 *Volume*

Does the text reveal a repetition of words and syntactical patterns from Ezekiel? Several points of contact have been observed between the theological vocabularies of John and Ezekiel. Individual words that the two have in

1 Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 29–32.

2 D. A. Carson comments: "The fourth Gospel is full of the OT, which it treats ... as the foundation for all that takes place in the revelation of God in Jesus"; *Divine Sovereignty*, 132.

3 Henry M. Shires, *Finding the Old Testament in the New* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974), 78, 82.

4 *Ibid.*, 97–98.

common and use similarly are know, send, hear, word, water, spirit, glory, shepherd, peace, and life. Certain words appear together in both works: water and cleansing; water and life; water and spirit; word, spirit, and life; wind, spirit, and life; know and I am. Phrases that share common syntactical patterns are: that they may know; I am; die in your sins; Son of man; and I will do it.

The vocabulary is used to express similar themes in both Ezekiel and John: knowing God; God's actions enabling people to know Him; God's messenger being a "sent" man; the importance of sharing God's words and not one's own; God's word bringing life; God dwelling with His people; and the enjoyment of peace in relationship with God. Larger images also have a close correspondence. A Temple desecrated must be replaced by a new Temple in which the glory of God will dwell. The new Temple will be a source of life-giving water that flows out in abundance. False shepherds are replaced by a Good Shepherd who functions as God's personal representative in caring for His people. The scattered sheep are gathered into one fold under one shepherd. They abide with God in what can only be described as a "fulness of life." In the face of death and decay, the one whom God has sent can speak the word and dead men come to life.

At every level—individual words, phrases, themes, and large images—echoes of Ezekiel can be "heard" in the Gospel. This "volume" of repetitive vocabulary is certainly more than mere background noise. It appears to reveal a distinct familiarity of John's Gospel with the language and emphases of Ezekiel. The important criteria have been satisfied.

1.3 *Recurrence*

Are textual allusions found elsewhere? According to Hays, if a writer clearly alludes to a passage or a block of scripture at one point it increases the likelihood that a supposed intertextual connection with the same passage at some other point is corroborated by that link.⁵ It is to be observed that the majority of the proposed allusions to Ezekiel in the Gospel of John come from a common block of material in Ezekiel's prophecies, chapters 33–48. Chapter 33 is a turning point in Ezekiel⁶ that includes the familiar "watchman" passage warning the wicked man that he will "die in his iniquity" if he does not repent (33:9), and it also has a call for the people to "hear what the word is that comes forth from the Lord" (33:30)—both of these ideas have Johannine

5 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 30.

6 "Chapter 33 serves as the immediate literary transition from all that precedes in the book of Ezekiel to the message of hope that begins with ch. 34"; Bruce Vawter and Leslie Hoppe, *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (1TC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 148.

counterparts. Then chapters 34, 36, and 37 provide shepherd imagery, water and spirit imagery, and resurrection imagery respectively. They also include images of gathering, unity of God's people, God's dwelling, a call to obedience, a covenant of peace, and the sanctuary.⁷ Finally, chapters 40–48 provide the images of the new Temple and the rivers of living water. Vocabulary, phrases, and images found in the Gospel tend to be drawn from these chapters. These multiple allusions to a block of scripture in Ezekiel (chapters 33–48) can be viewed as compliance with the criteria of recurrence.

1.4 *Thematic Coherence*

How well does the alleged echo fit into the narrative?⁸ This criterion is difficult to express objectively in regard to Ezekiel and John, but a test case might be the new Temple reading in John 2:12–21. John had introduced Jesus as the place where God's glory is manifest (1:14), a function previously fulfilled by the Temple. The inadequacy of the Jewish religion and the need to turn to a seventh source was implied by the sign at Cana (2:1–11). When Jesus came to the Temple, he found that it had become a marketplace and no longer functioned as a place where people could encounter God. Like the Temple of old, it would be destroyed, but God's promised Temple of the new age would become established so that God and His people could again dwell together as one. Later (7:38–39), at a Festival which recalled the water imagery of Ezekiel (among others) Jesus would offer the living water which flowed from Ezekiel's Temple. For us, the allusion to the new Temple in Ezekiel is consistent with the progression of the narrative in John. Thematic coherence appears to have been achieved.

1.5 *Historical Plausibility*

Could John have intended the alleged meaning affect?⁹ Or, put another way, is it likely that John both saw a connection with Ezekiel and expected his readers to "catch on" to his allusion? This question is more difficult than the last. However, if people in the narrative may be taken as possible examples of John's readership, then clues may be detected in the discourses on the new birth and the Good Shepherd. Nicodemus was expected to understand a reference to being "born of water and the spirit." If John had Ezekiel 36:25–26 in

7 Chapters 35, 38–39, are a bit of an interruption in the direct message of hope as God promises to deal with Israel's enemies—Mount Seir, Magog and Gog respectively.

8 Hays (*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 30) actually has "line of argument that Paul is developing." The question has been adapted here to fit with John's use of Ezekielian material in narrative rather than epistle.

9 John has been substituted for Paul. Again, Hays has been altered for purposes of this study.

mind, then he likely expected his readers to recall it as well, else the misunderstanding by Nicodemus is shared by the readers. Later, when Jesus' claim to be the Good Shepherd is met with the demand, "If you are the Christ, tell us plainly" (10:24), the allusion to the promised Davidic (messianic) shepherd of Ezekiel appears to have been picked up by the crowd. It would seem plausible that John's readers could have done the same. This is not to say that every reader of the Gospel could have made the connection, but that it is reasonable that John could have expected some to do so.

1.6 *History of Interpretation*

Have other readers, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes?¹⁰ While a few of the allusions proposed in this study are original to us,¹¹ the vast majority have been discovered by other students of the text. None have been wholly agreed upon,¹² but commentators have turned to Ezekiel on many occasions as a reference point from which to interpret the Fourth Gospel. The degree to which that has been done is perhaps greater than is generally known and hence one of the aims of this study is to demonstrate the weight of evidence that has been gathered pointing to Ezekiel as an important voice in the background to the Gospel. From Church Fathers to Reformation writers and present day commentators, readers of the Gospel have often heard echoes of Ezekiel in the narratives and discourses of John.¹³ The history of interpretation would seem to affirm a vital connection between the prophecies of Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel.

1.7 *Satisfaction*

Does it produce in the reader a satisfying account of the effect of the intertextual relation? The point is, does the proposed intertextual link explain or illuminate the text under scrutiny in a manner that satisfies the reader. According to Hays this last criteria is the final, most important test;¹⁴ it is also the most subjective and the least defensible of all. What satisfies one reader may not satisfy

10 Hays refers to this as a test against arbitrariness while still being one of the least reliable criteria. It is possible for important echoes to be overlooked, but not likely. It is also possible to develop a tradition of interpretation that distorts the original voice of the author; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 31.

11 For example, tracing "I will do it" in John 14:13–14 to Ezekiel's "I the Lord have spoken, I will do it" (24:14 and others).

12 For example, D. M. G. Stalker who flatly denies that the Good Shepherd of John 10 is to be attributed to Ezekiel; *Ezekiel*, 41.

13 This study has cited Jerome, Calvin, and a host of modern authors in this regard.

14 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 32.

another, but in the absence of the original author, the reader has to make the final call. In the case of Ezekiel and John, and in light of the evidence amassed above, we are satisfied that significant intertextual connections exist between the book of Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel.

2 Conclusions Regarding Influence

Having concluded that the book of Ezekiel, in a general way, has met all the criteria for establishing an intertextual connection, what does this imply for the more basic question of influence? Do the intertextual links reveal significant influence? We would answer in the affirmative, but qualifications must be made.

From the study of theological vocabulary, it became evident that Ezekiel could not account for all that is found in the Gospel. Numerous instances of common vocabulary and usage show that Ezekiel left his mark on John's vocabulary, but John obviously gathered material from other Old Testament works and made unique contributions of his own.¹⁵

As both primary and secondary points of contact were discussed, it became apparent that John often blends images from various sources in his Gospel. Jesus is both the new Tabernacle and the new Temple in the Gospel. The rivers of living water likely recall both Ezekiel's Temple and the Rock in the wilderness. Sometimes Ezekiel's voice is the strongest to be heard in the chorus of Old Testament witnesses as with the Good Shepherd. At other points he has almost faded into the background and can scarcely be heard as in the case of the "Son of man." Sadly, sometimes his voice is missed when it likely should not be, as in regard to being born of water and spirit.

It is obvious that John does not slavishly follow his sources. John often adapts tradition for his own purposes in the Gospel. The Good Shepherd of Ezekiel lives forever, but in the Fourth Gospel the shepherd will lay down his life for the sheep. The water from Ezekiel's Temple flows into the Arabah, but in John it becomes a fountain of water within the believer springing up into life eternal (4:14). In Ezekiel God sanctifies His name and then Israel (36:22–32; 37:28), in the Fourth Gospel Jesus sanctifies himself and then his followers (17:17–19). The echoes are heard through the text but John has not left them untouched. It is as though he resists, to borrow a Synoptic phrase, putting new

¹⁵ His emphasis on "Father" and his use of πιστεύω seem to have a special Johannine flavor, although John does connect believing with obedience (3:36), an Ezekielian theme.

wine into old wineskins. The Jesus he presents to the reader is all that the Old Testament promised, and more!

In short, Ezekiel's prophecies do not dominate the attention of John in the Fourth Gospel. John seems immersed in the language and thought of the Old Testament and Jewish tradition as a whole and does not focus in on presenting Jesus as the fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecies specifically, but rather as the fulfillment of the broad promises of God found in all of Israel's religious heritage, of which Ezekiel is a part. For John Ezekiel is one voice amidst a vast choir of voices which bear witness to Jesus (5:39), albeit a strong voice indeed.

However, having acknowledged that Ezekiel is only part of the whole, it our conclusion that he carries a larger role in the Gospel than is usually ascribed to him. True, there are vast blocks of material in John that have little, if any, connection with Ezekiel. The passion narratives, so important for the Gospel, do not yield evidence of Ezekiel's influence. In fact, outside of the Book of Signs (chapters 2–12) there is little evidence of Ezekiel's influence except at the point of some common vocabulary and themes. All the primary points of contact and many of the secondary ones fall within chapters 2–12.¹⁶ Still, in the images that Ezekiel does provide—new Temple, living water, Good Shepherd, people being raised to life, and others—Ezekiel leaves a striking mark on the shape of the Gospel. It is difficult to imagine the Johannine Jesus apart from the images that can be traced to Ezekiel. Had there been no prophecies of Ezekiel, the Gospel of John would have had a profoundly different look.

3 Value for Interpretation

The case for multiple intertextual links between Ezekiel and the Fourth Gospel has been established and the fact of major influence of Ezekiel in John's presentation of Jesus has been highlighted. Now, how is an awareness of Ezekiel's voice in the background to the Fourth Gospel meaningful for interpretation? Is it necessary to take this background into consideration when interpreting the text of John?

In a sense, the value of intertextual relationships for interpretation is self-evident. Contemporary scholars generally recognize that the New Testament must be read in light of the Old. Smith insists: "The Old Testament is the indispensable theological-historical background for reading and understanding

16 The fact that the major evidences of Ezekielian influence are found in the Book of Signs suggests to us that it dates back to the earliest stages of the Johannine tradition.

the New.”¹⁷ Shires agrees: “The New Testament cannot be fully or properly understood without a knowledge of the Jewish scripture.”¹⁸ If this is true of the Testaments as a whole, it is especially true of passages in the Testaments which are intertextually related.

Specifically, though, what difference does Ezekiel make for understanding the Fourth Gospel? Admittedly, there are many instances in which intertextual links with Ezekiel are secondary and do little to alter the meaning for readers of John. These passages either require some other text to illumine their meaning (e.g., Son of man) or they are discernible without reference to any background (e.g., “I will do it”). Some passages can be readily understood apart from Ezekiel, but the recognition of an intertextual link adds depth to interpretation (e.g., rivers of living water, and the Good Shepherd). Certain other passages seem to require an awareness of Ezekiel to catch the christological and eschatological meaning that John presents in the Gospel (e.g., the new Temple). And there are points at which the Book of Ezekiel may provide the single, best source for understanding John’s meaning (e.g., born of water and spirit). Awareness of intertextuality can be essential.

This is not to say that commentators who do not see the same intertextual connections that we perceive are poor expositors. The New Testament has a richness that will forever render incomplete any interpretation of it. Every effort to expound its meaning will fall short in some aspect or else “the whole world itself could not contain the books that would be written” (John 21:25). The excellent studies by Kysar and others who never mention an intertextual reference to Ezekiel will continue to add to the growing wealth of knowledge about John’s Gospel. Different approaches to reading the Gospel, some that totally ignore the historical questions, will further our knowledge of John’s Gospel precisely because they refuse to travel down well-worn trails, and these must be appreciated. But the old questions of historical backgrounds cannot be neglected without developing serious gaps in Johannine studies. This monograph is a clarion call to re-examine the old historical issues from a different perspective. A rich resource of meaning can be gained from listening for Ezekiel’s voice in the background to the Gospel.

A special contribution of this study has been to show that the Apocalypse is not the only piece of Johannine literature that has strong ties to Ezekiel—the Fourth Gospel has as well. Several questions emerge that deserve an attention that this study has not been able to provide. What significance did the Book of Ezekiel have for the Johannine community as a whole? Do his prophecies

¹⁷ D. Moody Smith, Jr., “The Use of the Old Testament in the New,” 63.

¹⁸ Shires, *Finding the Old Testament*, 25.

also influence the contours of thought in the Epistles of John? Were there certain characteristics about the community that naturally endeared it to the exiled priest-turned-prophet? It has been observed that both the Gospel and the Apocalypse have close ties with the prophecies of restoration in Ezekiel, but the Apocalypse utilizes major blocks of material from the judgment passages as well. Do the Gospel and Apocalypse utilize material from the prophet differently? Does this say anything about different outlooks, or tensions, within the community? What is needed is a study that will survey the use of Ezekielian material in the Fourth Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse to examine the evidence in light of these questions. Meanwhile, Ezekiel can be appreciated for playing a large role in shaping the portrait of Jesus provided in the Gospel of John.

Bibliography

Books and Commentaries

- Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 20–48*. Word Biblical Commentary, 29. Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1990.
- Ashton, John. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. *The Gospel of the Hellenists*. Edited by Carl H. Kraeling. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.
- Barclay, William. *Introduction to John and the Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2nd. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Gospel of Life: Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1991.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *John*. Word Biblical Themes. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1989.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1963.
- Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. Edited by A. H. McNeile. International Critical Commentary, vol. 29, parts 1 and 2. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1929.
- Betz, Otto. *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Beutler, Johannes, and Robert T. Fortna. *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Blackwood, Andrew W., Jr. *The Other Son of Man*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezekiel*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Bøe, Sverre. *Gog and Magog: Ezekiel 38–39 as a Pre-Text for Revelation 19, 17–21 and 20, 7–10*. WUNT 2/135. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Boice, James M. *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John*. Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970.

- Boismard, Marie-Émile. *Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology*. Trans. Benedict T. Viviano. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Louvaniensium, 84. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Borgen, Peder. *Bread From Heaven*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, x. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Bowman, John. *The Fourth Gospel and the Jews: A Study in R. Akiba, Esther and the Gospel of John*. Pittsburg: Pickwick Press, 1975.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Brooke, A. E., ed. *The Commentary of Origen on St. John's Gospel*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. Vols. 29 & 29A. Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966 & 1970.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel and the Epistles of John: A Concise Commentary*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988.
- Brownlee, William H. *Ezekiel 1–19*. Word Biblical Commentary 28. Waco: Word, 1986.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bruce, F. F. *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John*. Trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Burge, Gary M. *Interpreting the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Burge, Gary M. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Bynum, Wm. R. *The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37*. NovTSup, 144. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Cadman, W. H. *The Open Heaven*. Edited by G. B. Caird. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.
- Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John*. 2 vols. *Calvin's Commentaries*. Trans. William Pringle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.
- Carley, Keith W. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Carley, Keith W. *Ezekiel Among the Prophets*. Studies in Biblical Theology 31. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1974.

- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Carson, D. A. *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension*. New Foundations Theological Library. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1990.
- Clayton, Jay, and Eric Rothstein, eds. *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
- Cockerill, Gareth Lee. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Cooke, G. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Ezekiel*. The Daily Study Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- Cross, Frank L., ed. *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1957.
- Cross, Frank M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Revised ed. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961.
- Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1981.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Trans. Shirley Guthrie and Charles Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Johannine Circle*. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, and Anderson, Paul N., eds. *John and Judaism: A Contested Relationship in Context*. RBS 87. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools*. SBL Dissertation Series 26. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Curtis, W. A. *Jesus the Teacher: A Study of His Method and Message Based Mainly on the Earlier Gospels*. London: Oxford University Press, 1943.
- Crutcher, Rhonda G. *That He Might Be Revealed: Water Imagery and the Identity of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2015.
- Daniélou, Jean. *Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne*. Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1966.
- Daniélou, Jean. *Primitive Christian Symbols*. Trans. Donald Attwater. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1964.
- Davidson, A. B. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1906.
- Davies, W. D. *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- de Vries, Pieter. *The Kabod of YHWH in the Old Testament: With Particular Reference to the Book of Ezekiel*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 65. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Duke, Paul D. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Evidence for Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Eichrodt, Walter. *Ezekiel*. Old Testament Library. Trans. Cosslett Quin. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970.
- Eichrodt, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. Old Testament Library. Trans. J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- Ellis, Peter. *The Genius of John. A Composition-Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1984.
- Ellison, H. L. *Ezekiel: The Man and His Message*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Evans, Craig A. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*. JSNTS 89. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Feinburg, Charles Lee. *The Prophecy of Ezekiel: The Glory of the Lord*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1969.
- Fewell, Danna Nolan, ed. *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.
- Fletcher, Michelle. *Reading Revelation as Pastiche: Imitating the Past*. LNTS 571. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.
- Fortna, Robert T. *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor. From Narrative Source to Present Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Fortna, Robert T. *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel*. SNTS MS 11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981.
- Fuller, Reginald. *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus: An Examination of the Presuppositions of New Testament Theology*. Studies in Biblical Theology 12. Chicago: A. R. Allenson, Publisher, 1954.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. NovTSup 23. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Glasson, Thomas F. *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*. Studies in Biblical Theology, 40. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Grayston, Kenneth. *The Gospel of John*. Epworth Commentaries. London: Epworth Press, 1990.
- Guiling, Aileen. *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Theology*. Downer's Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970.

- Guthrie, Donald. "John." In *The New Bible Commentary: Revised*. Eds. D. Guthrie and J. A. Motyer. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Habner, Philip B. *The "I Am" of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and Thought*. Biblical Series 26. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *John*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Trans. Robert Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Hamid-Khani, Saeed. *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Neuen Testament 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Hays, Richard. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2016.
- Hays, Richard. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Johannine Question*. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1989.
- Herzog, Fredrick. *Liberation Theology: Liberation in Light of the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Seabury Press, 1972.
- Hillman, Richard. *Intertextuality and Romance in Renaissance Drama*. London: Macmillan, 1992.
- Hoskyns, Edwin C. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Francis N. Davey. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1947.
- Hunter, A. M. *According to John*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968.
- Hunter, A. M. *The Gospel According to John*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Hyllen, Susan. *Allusion and Meaning in John 6*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Johansson, Nils. *Parakletoi: Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Godtt in der Alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln, 1940.
- Johnston, George. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Keener, Craig. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publisher, 2003.
- Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Klein, Ralph W. *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.
- Klein, Ralph W. *John*. Augsburg Commentaries on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1987.
- Klein, Ralph W. *John's Story of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

- Köstenberger, Andreas. "John," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Eds. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker/Nottingham: Apollos, 2007, 415–512.
- Kristeva, Julia. *La Revolution du langage poetique*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1974.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Semiotike: Recherches pour une semanalyse*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1969.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Revised English edition. Trans. Howard C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Kysar, Robert. *John's Story of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Kysar, Robert. *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1975.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Levenson, Jon Douglas. *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48*. Harvard Semitic Monograph Series, 10. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Lightfoot, R. H. *St. John's Gospel*. Edited by C. F. Evans. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible. Greenwood, S. C.: Oliphants, 1972.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *Jesus Son of Man. A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *John*. New Testament Guides. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1990.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. *The Gospel of John*. Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.
- Manning, Gary T. *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Marsh, John. *Saint John*. Westminster Pelican Commentaries. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Epistles of John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martin, Ralph P. *New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd. rev. ed. Nashville: Abindon Press, 1979.
- Meeks, Wayne. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *John*. New International Biblical Commentary 4. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrikson Publishing, 1989.
- Minear, Paul S. *Images of the Church in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

- Moloney, Francis J. *Belief in the Word: Readings in the Fourth Gospel, John 1–4*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Morris, Leon. *Jesus Is the Christ. Studies in the Theology of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Morrish, George. *A Concordance of the Septuagint*. Regency Reference Library. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d. (originally published in London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Ltd., 1887).
- Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1991.
- Nicol, W. *The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel. Tradition and Redaction*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- O'Day, Gail. *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Odeberg, Hugo. *The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in Its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World*. Reprinted from a 1929 edition. Chicago: Argonaut Publishers, 1968.
- Olsson, Birger. *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel. A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1–11 and 4:1–42*. Coniectanea biblica, New Testament 6. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1974.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Revelation*. BECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002.
- Painter, John. *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Peterson, Brian Neil. *John's Use of Ezekiel: Understanding the Unique Perspective of the Fourth Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.
- Pietersma, Albert and Wright, Benjamin G., eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Porter, Stanley E. and Gabriel, Andrew K., eds. *Johannine Writings and Apocalyptic: An Annotated Bibliography*. Johannine Studies 1. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Porter, Stanley E. and Ong, Hughson T. *The Origins of John's Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Reim, Günter. *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*. Society for NTS Monograph Series, 22. Edited by M. Black. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Robbins, Vernon K. *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Robertson, A. T. "The Fourth Gospel." *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. Vol. 5. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1932.
- Robinson, John A. T. *The Priority of John*. London: SCM Press, 1985.
- Rowley, H. H. *The Faith of Israel*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956.

- Sanders, Joseph N., and B. A. Mastin. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries Series. London: A. and C. Black, 1968.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 vols. Trans. Kevin Smyth. New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1990.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Ego eimi: die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums*. 2nd. ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoech und Ruprect, 1965.
- Segovia, Fernando F. *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Selwyn, Edward G. *The First Epistle of Peter*. 2nd. ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1955.
- Septuaginta*. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung Stuttgart, 1935.
- Shires, Henry M. *Finding the Old Testament in the New*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.
- Sidebottom, E. M. *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- Siliezar, Carlos Raul Sosa. *Creation Imagery in the Gospel of John*. LNTS 546. London: T&T Clark, 2015.
- Simoens, Yves. *Apocalypse de Jean: Apocalypse de Jésus Christ*. Paris: Éditions Facultés Jésuites de Paris, 2008.
- Smalley, Stephen S. *John, Evangelist and Interpreter*. Greenwood: Attic Press, 1978.
- Smith, D. Moody, Jr. *John Among the Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Smith, J. B. *Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament*. Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1955.
- Sloyan, Gerard S. *What Are They Saying About John?* New York: Paulist Press, 1991.
- Sloyan, Gerard S. *John*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1988.
- Stalker, D. M. G. *Ezekiel*. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1968.
- Stendahl, Krister, ed. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.
- Stol, M. *Zwangerschap in geboorte bij de Babyloniers in de Bijbel*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983.
- Strachan, Robert H. *The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1920.
- Strong, James. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*. Vancouver, B. C.: Praise Bible Publishers, Ltd., n.d.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*. Reading the New Testament Series. New York: Crossroads, 1992.
- Tasker, R. V. G. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.
- Tasker, R. V. G. *The Old Testament in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946.

- Taylor, John Bernard. *Ezekiel: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downer's Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969.
- Teeple, Howard. *The Literary Origin of the Gospel of John*. Evanston: Religion and Ethics Institute, 1974.
- Tenney, Merrill C. *The Gospel of John*. EBC 9. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981.
- Thomas, John Christopher and Macchia, Frank D. *Revelation*. Two Horizons New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Tödt, Heinz Eduard. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. New Testament Library. Trans. Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965.
- Turner, Nigel. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Vol. 4. *Style*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1976.
- Turro, James C. *The Book of Ezekiel*. Old Testament Reading Guide. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1967.
- Vawter, Bruce, and Leslie J. Hoppe. *A New Heart. A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Wahlde, Urban C. von. *The Earliest Version of John's Gospel. Recovering the Gospel of Signs*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Publisher, 1989.
- Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel According to St. John*. London: Murray, 1881.
- Westminster Study Bible*. Revised Standard Version. New York: Collin's Clear-Type Press, 1965.
- Wevers, John W., ed. *Ezekiel*. New Century Bible. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1969.
- Wigram, George V. *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1980 (originally published in London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Ltd., 1843).
- Wood, James D. *The Interpretation of the Bible: A Historical Introduction*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd., 1958.
- Worton, Michael, and Judith Still, eds. *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.
- Yarbrough, Robert W. *1-3 John*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Yee, Gale A. *Jewish Feasts and the Gospel of John*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989.
- Zimmerli, Walter. *Ezechiel*. The Netherlands: H. Veenman and Zonen, 1969.
- Zimmerli, Walter. *Ezekiel*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Trans. James D. Martin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979 and 1983.
- Zimmerli, Walter. *I Am Yahweh*. Trans. Douglas W. Scott. Edited by Walter Brueggemann. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.

Articles and Essays

- Albright, W. F. "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John." In *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: Studies in Honor of C. H. Dodd*. Eds. William D. Davies and David Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Anderson, Paul N. "John and Qumran: Discovery and Interpretation over Sixty Years," in *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*. Edited by Mary L. Coloe and Tom Thatcher. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. "The Shepherd Poems of John 10: Their Culture and Style." *Theological Review*, 14 (1993), 3–21.
- Baron, Lori. "The Shema in John's Gospel and Jewish Restorationist Eschatology," in *John and Judaism: A Contested Relationship in Context*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Paul N. Anderson. RBS 87. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 1, *From the Beginning to Jerome*. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. London: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Relation of Gnosticism to the New Testament: The Theological Vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel and the Gospel of Truth." In *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon Snyder. London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962. 210–223.
- Bassler, Jollette. "Mixed Signals: Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 108 (1989), 635–646.
- Beare, Francis W. "The Spirit of Life and Truth: The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 3 (1987), 110–125.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. "John 3:3,5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom." *ExpTim* 97 (1986), 167–170.
- Becker, Jürgen. "Ich bin die Auferstehung und das Leben: Eine Skizze der johanneischen Christologie." *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 39 (83), 138–151.
- Belleville, Linda A. "Born of Water and Spirit: John 3:5." *TrinJ* 1 (1980), 125–141.
- Borgen, Peder. "God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel." In *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Edwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to *Numen*), XIV. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- Borgen, Peder. "Some Jewish Exegetical Traditions as Background for Son of Man Sayings in John's Gospel." In *L'Evangile de Jean: Sources, redaction, theologie*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, XLIV. Edited by M. de Jonge. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1977, 243–258.
- Borgen, Peder. "The Unique Vision of God in Jesus." *Bread From Heaven*. NovTSup 10. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Brawley, Robert L. "An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28–29." *JBL* 112 (1993), 427–443.

- Brown, Raymond E. "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 13 (1967), 113–132.
- Brown, Raymond E. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.
- Brownlee, William H. "Whence the Gospel According to John?" In *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd rev. ed. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1990.
- Bullock, C. Hassell. "Ezekiel, Bridge Between the Testaments." *JETS* 25 (1982), 23–31.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Ἰνῶσκει." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 3. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Trans. G. W. Bromily. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964, 689–719.
- Busse, Ulrich. "Offene Fragen zu John 10." *NTS* 33 (1987), 516–531.
- Cardwell, Kenneth. "The Fish on the Fire: John 21:9." *ExpTim* 102 (1990), 12–14.
- Carroll, John T. "Present and Future in Fourth Gospel 'Eschatology.'" *BibThBul* 19 (1989), 63–68.
- Carson, D. A. "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel." *TynBul* 13 (1982), 59–91.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Re-interpreting John: How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Revolutionized Our Understanding of the Gospel of John." *BRev* 9 (1993), 19–25, 54.
- Charlesworth, James H. "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13–4:26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John." *NTS* 15 (1969), 389–418.
- Christensen, Jens. "Le Fils de l'Homme s'en va, ainsi qu'il est écrit de lui." *Studia Theologica* 10 (1957), 28–39.
- Clark, Douglas. "Signs in Wisdom and John." *CBQ* 45 (1983), 201–209.
- Cook, W. Robert. "The 'Glory' Motif in the Johannine Corpus." *JETS* 27 (1984), 291–297.
- Cortes, Juan B. "Yet Another Look at John 7:37–39." *CBQ* 29 (1967), 75–86.
- Cotterell, F. P. "The Nicodemus Conversation: A Fresh Appraisal." *ExpTim* 96 (1985), 237–242.
- Coetzee, J. C. "Life (Eternal Life) in John's Writings and the Qumran Scrolls." *Neot* 6. Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1972), 50–66.
- Dahl, Nils A. "The Johannine Church and History." In *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon Snyder. London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962, 124–142.
- Daniélou, Jean. "Jean VII, 37–39 et Ezechiel 47, 1–11." In *Studia Evangelica* vol. 2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964.
- Daniélou, Jean. "Le symbolisme de l' eau vive (John 7:37–39, 44; Revelation 7:37–39; 22:1–2; Ezekiel 37:25–27; 47)." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 32 (1958), 335–346.
- Davies, W. D. "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.
- de la Potterie, Ignace. "The Truth in Saint John." In *The Interpretation of John*. Edited by John Ashton. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

- Deeley, Mary Katharine. "Ezekiel's Shepherd and John's Jesus: A Case Study in the Appropriation of Biblical Texts." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997, 252–64.
- Delebecque, Edouard. "Retour sur Jean 10:9." *Revista Bíblica* 96 (1989), 81–94.
- Dennison, William David. "Miracles as Signs." *BibThBul* 6 (1976), 190–202.
- Dodd, C. H. "The Prophecy of Caiaphas (John 11:47–53)." In *Neotestamentica et Patristica: eine Freundesgabe, Oscar Cullmann*. NovTSup 6. Edited by Amos N. Wilder, et al. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962.
- Emerton, J. A. "The Hundred and Fifty-three Fishes in John XXI.11." *JTS* 9 (1958), 86–88.
- Emerton, J. A. "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery." *JTS* 9 (1958), 225–242.
- Enz, Jacob J. "The Book of Exodus as a Literary Type for the Gospel of John." *JBL* 76 (1957), 208–215.
- Evans, Craig A. "On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel." *BZ* 26 (1982), 79–83.
- Evans, Craig A. "The Voice from Heaven: A Note on John 12:28." *CBQ* 43 (1981), 405–409.
- Fensham, F. C. "Love in the Writings of Qumran and John." *Neot* 6 (1972), 67–81.
- Filson, Floyd V. "Who Was the Beloved Disciple?" *JBL* 68 (1949), 83–88.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth S. "The Quest for the Johannine School: The Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 23 (1977), 402–427.
- Fischer, Karl Martin. "Der johanneische Christus und der gnostische Erlöser: Überlegungen auf Grund von Joh 10." In *Gnosis und Neues Testament: Studien aus Religionswissenschaft und Theologie*. Edited by Karl V. Tröger. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus Mohn, 1973.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *NTS* 7 (1961), 297–333.
- Fowler, Russell. "Born of Water and the Spirit (John 3:5)." *ExpTim* 82 (1971), 159.
- Fox, Michael V. "The Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones." *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 51 (1980), 1–15.
- Fredericks Daniel C. "Diglossia, Revelation, and Ezekiel's Inaugural Rite." *JETS* 41 (1998), 189–99.
- Freed, Edwin D. "Ego eimi in John 8:24 in the Light of Its Context and Jewish Messianic Belief." *JTS* 33 (1982), 163–167.
- Gärtner, Bertil E. "The Pauline and Johannine Idea of 'To Know God' Against the Hellenistic Background." *NTS* 14 (1968), 209–231.
- Goodwin, C. "How Did John Treat His Sources?" *JBL* 73 (1954), 61–75.
- Gordon, T. David. "The Waters of Birth: John 3:5 and 1 John 5:6–8." *NTS* 35 (1989), 154–160.
- Goulder, M. D. "The Apocalypse of John as an Annual Cycle of Prophecies." *NTS* 27 (1981), 342–367.

- Grassi, Joseph A. "Ezekiel XXXVII.1–14 and the New Testament." *NTS* 11 (1965), 162–164.
- Grelot, Pierre. "Jean VII, 38, eau du rocher ou source du Temple?" *Revue Biblique* 70 (1963), 43–51.
- Grigsby, Bruce H. "If Any Man Thirsts ...": Observations on the Rabbinic Background of John 7:37–39." *Biblica*, 67 (1986), 101–108.
- Grigsby, Bruce H. "Gematria and John 21:11—Another Look at Ezekiel 47:10." *ExpTim* 95 (1984), 177–178.
- Grob, Francis. "Jésus: la vigne (Jean 15)." *Foi et Voi*, 86 (1987), 9–16.
- Hengel, Martin. "Bishop Lightfoot and the Tübingen School on the Gospel of John and the Second Century." *DUJ* (1992), 23–51.
- Hengel, Martin. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 12 (1990), 19–41.
- Hodges, Zane C. "Problem Passages in the Gospel of John, Part 7: Rivers of Living Water—John 7:37–39." *BibSac* 136 (1979), 239–248.
- Hodges, Zane C. "Problem Passages in the Gospel of John, Part 3: Water and Spirit—John 3:5." *BibSac* 135 (1978), 206–220.
- Hooke, Samuel Henry. "The Spirit Was Not Yet (Jn 7:39)." *NTS* 9 (1963), 372–380.
- Jeal, Roy R. "Sociorhetorical Intertexture." In *Diverse Strategies for New Testament Interpretation of Texts*. Edited by B. J. Oropeza and Steve Moyise. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2016.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "θύρα." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 3. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Trans. G. W. Bromily. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964, 173–180.
- Jonge, Marinus de. "Nicodemus and Jesus: Some Observations on Misunderstanding and Understanding in the Fourth Gospel." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 53 (1971), 337–359.
- Kiley, Mark. "The Exegesis of God: Jesus' Signs in John 1–11." In *SBL Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1988, 555–569.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "The Punctuation of John 7:37–38." *JTS* 11 (1960), 340–342.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "The Religious Background of the Fourth Gospel." In *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F. L. Cross. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Limited, 1957.
- Kittel, Gerhard. "ἀκούω." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 3. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Trans. G. W. Bromily. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964, 217–225.
- Kling, Sheri D. "Wisdom Became Flesh: An Analysis of the Prologue to the Gospel of John." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 40.3 (2013), 179–87.
- Koester, Craig. "Hearing, Seeing and Believing in the Gospel of John." *Biblica* 70 (1989), 327–348.
- Kossen, H. B. "Who Were the Greeks of John 12:20?" *Studies in John*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. xxiv. Leiden: E. J. Brill, (1970), 97–110.

- Kowalski, Beate. "Transformation of Ezekiel in John's Revelation." In *Transforming Visions: Transformations of Text, Tradition, and Theology in Ezekiel*. Edited by William A. Tooman and Michael A. Lyons. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.
- Kruse, Heinz. "Magni Pisces Centum Quinquaginta Tres." *Verbum Domini* 38 (1960), 129–148.
- Kühn, Karl Georg. "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.
- Kysar, Robert. "Johannine Metaphor—Meaning and Function: A Literary Case Study of John 10:1–8." *Semeia*, 53 (1991), 81–111.
- León-Dufour, Xavier. "Jesus le bon pasteur." In *Les paraboles evangeliques: perspectives nouvelles: XIIe congress de l'ACFEB*. Edited by Jean Delorme. Lyon: (1987). cf. 361–373.
- León-Dufour, Xavier. "Towards a Symbolic Reading of the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 27 (1981), 439–456.
- León-Dufour, Xavier. "Le signe du Temple selon saint Jean." *Recherches de science religieuse*, 39 (1951–1952), 155–175.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "Ezekiel and Individual Responsibility." *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965), 452–467.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "Rebuking the Spirit: A New Analysis of the Lazarus Story of John 11." *NTS* 38 (1992), 89–104.
- Lust, J. "The Order of the Final Events in Revelation and Ezekiel." In *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 53. Paris: Leuven University Press, 1980.
- Maarten J. J. Menken. "What Authority does the Fourth Evangelist claim for his Book?" In *Paul, John, and Apocalyptic Eschatology: Studies in Honour of Martinus C. DeBoer*. Edited by J. Krans. NovTestSup 149. Leiden: Brill, 2013, 186–202.
- Mackay, Cameron. "Ezekiel in the New Testament." *CQR* 162 (1961), 4–16.
- Maier, Paul. Review of *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*, by Vernon K. Robbins. *The Christian Century*, 101 (August 1984), 753.
- Martin, James P. "John 10:1–10." *Int* 32 (1978), 171–175.
- Matson, Mark A. "The Contribution of the Temple Cleansing by the Fourth Gospel." In *SBL Papers*, 31. Edited by E. Lovering. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- McEleney, Neil J. "153 Great Fishes (John 21:11)—Gematriacal Atbash." *Biblica* 58 (1977), 411–417.
- Meagher, John C. "John 1:14 and the New Temple." *JBL* 88 (1969), 57–68.
- Mercer, Calvin. "Jesus the Apostle: 'Sending' and the Theology of John." *JETS* 35 (1992), 457–462.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm. "ὁδός." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 5. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Trans. G. W. Bromily. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967, 42–114.

- Moloney, Francis J. "The Johannine Son of Man." 2nd. ed. *Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose*, 14. Rome: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano, 1978.
- Morgan, Richard. "Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations." *Int* 11 (1957), 155–165.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. "Die Vorstellungen des Spätjudentums vom heiligen Geist als Fürsprecher und der johanneische Paraklet." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 32 (1933), 97–130.
- Murphy, Roland. "The Christian Understanding of the Old Testament." *Theology Digest* 18 (1970), 321–332.
- Myers, Alicia D. "Abiding Words: An Introduction to Perspectives on John's Use of Scripture." In *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard. RBS 81. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015, 1–20.
- Neirynck, Frans. "John 21." *NTS* 36 (1990), 321–336.
- Niditch, Susan. "Ezekiel 40–48 in a Visionary Context." *CBQ* 48 (1986), 208–224.
- Niedner, Frederick A. "Sermon at the Holy Communion (Ezekiel 36; John 4)." In *Christian Initiation*. Edited by D. Brockopp. 1981, 139–144.
- O'Day, Gail R. "Intertextuality." *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by J. H. Hayes. Nashville: Abingdon, 1993.
- Olbricht, Thomas. "The Theology of the Signs in the Gospel of John." In *Johannine Studies: Essays in Honor of Frank Pack*. Edited by James E. Priest. Malibu, Calif.: Pepperdine University Press, 1989.
- Owen, O. T. "One Hundred and Fifty Three Fishes." *ExpTim* 100 (1988), 52–54.
- Painter, John. "The Church and Israel in the Gospel of John: A Response." *NTS* 25 (1978), 103–112.
- Pamment, Margaret. "John 3:5, 'Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.'" *Novum Testamentum*, 25 (1983), 189–190.
- Pamment, Margaret. "The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel." *JTS* 36 (1985), 56–66.
- Pitta, Antonio. "Ichthys ed opsarion in Gv 21:1–14: semplice variazione lessicale o differenza con valore simbolico?" *Biblica*, 71 (1990), 348–364.
- Powell, Mark Allan. "Narrative Criticism: The Emergence of a Prominent Reading Strategy," in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Kelly R. Iverson and Christopher W. Skinner. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011, 19–43.
- Price, James L. "Light from Qumran upon Some Aspects of Johannine Theology." In *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd rev. ed. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1990.
- Rengstorff, Karl H. "σημείον." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 7. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromily. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Riesenfeld, H. "The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology." In *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: Studies in Honor of C. H. Dodd*. Edited by William D. Davies and David Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

- Riga, Peter J. "Signs of Glory: The Use of 'semeion' in St. John's Gospel." *Int* 17 (1963), 402–424.
- Romeo, Joseph A. "Gematria and John 21:11—The Children of God." *JBL* 97 (1978), 263–264.
- Rylaarsdam, J. C. "Booths, Feast of." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. 1. Edited by George A. Buttrick et al. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Sanders, J. N. "Who Was the Disciple Whom Jesus Loved?" In *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F. L. Cross. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1957.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81 (1962), 1–13.
- Schenke, Ludger. "John 7–10, Eine dramatische Szene." *ZNW* 80 (1989), 172–192.
- Schneiders, Sandra M. "John 21:1–14." *Int* 43 (1989), 70–75.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "The Son of Man Again." *NTS* 9 (1963), 256–261.
- Segovia, Fernando F. "The Journeys of the Word of God." *Semeia* 53 (1991), 23–54.
- Sidebottom, E. M. "The Ascent and Descent of the Son of Man." *Anglican Theological Review* 38 (1957), 115–122.
- Sidebottom, E. M. "The Son of Man as Man in the Fourth Gospel." *ExpTim* 68 (1956), 231–235, 280–283.
- Smith, D. Moody, Jr. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New." In *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*. Edited by J. M. Efrid. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972.
- Smith, D. Moody, Jr. "The Sources of the Gospel of John." *NTS* 10 (1964), 336–351.
- Smith, Robert H. "Exodus Typology in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 81 (1962), 329–342.
- Spriggs, D. G. "Meaning of Water in John 3:5." *ExpTim* 85 (1974), 149–150.
- Stendahl, Krister. "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.
- Sturch, R. L. "Jeremias and John: Parables in the Fourth Gospel." *ExpTim* 89 (1978), 235–238.
- Summers, Ray. "Born of Water and Spirit." In *The Teacher's Yoke: Studies in Memory of Henry Trantham*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 1964.
- Talbert, Charles H. "Myth of a Descending-Ascending Redeemer in Mediterranean Antiquity." *NTS* 22 (1976), 418–440.
- Tenney, Merrill C. "Topics from the Gospel of John, Part 1: The Person of the Father." *BibSac* 132 (1975), 37–46.
- Thyen, H. "Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium." *Theologische Rundschau* 44 (1979), 97–134.
- Tietze, Godfrey. "Knowledge of God in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Bible and Religion* 22 (1954), 14–19.
- Trüding, Paul. "The 153 Fishes: A Response and a Further Suggestion." *ExpTim* 102 (1990), 11–12.

- Turner, Max, and Gary M. Burge. "The Anointed Community: A Review and Response." *EQ* 62 (1990), 253–268.
- Vanhoye, Albert. "L'Utilisation du Livre d'Ezechiel dans l'Apocalypse." *Biblica* 43 (1962), 436–476.
- Vawter, Bruce. "The Gospel According to John." *Jerome Biblical Commentary*. 2 vols. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, et al. Engelwood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1968, 11, 414–466.
- Vawter, Bruce. "Ezekiel and John." *CBQ* 26 (1964), 450–458.
- Witherington, Ben. "The Waters of Birth: John 3:5 and 1 John 5:6–8." *NTS* 35 (1989), 155–160.
- Wood, William Pape. "John 2:13–22." *Int* 45 (1991), 59–63.
- Zimmerli, Walter. "The Message of the Prophet Ezekiel." *Int* 23 (1969), 131–157.
- Zimmerli, Walter. "The Word of God in the Book of Ezekiel." *Journal for Theology and Church* 4 (1967), 1–13.

Unpublished Works

- Eakins, Joel Kenneth. "Ezekiel's Influence on the Exilic Isaiah." Ph.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1970.
- Rutz, Jean-Pierre M. "Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation of Prophetic Language in Revelation 16:17–19:10." Dissertation, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1989.
- Vogelgesang, Jeffery M. "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1985.

Index of Subjects and Modern Authors

- angels 77–78, 113
apocalyptic 1, 13, 70, 100, 109
- Barrett, C. K. 5, 10, 18, 63, 106
belief / believe / πίστις / πιστεύω 29–30, 50, 98
Boyarin, Daniel 7, 8, 9
bread 39, 41–42, 48, 66
Brown, Raymond E. 4–6, 61, 70, 77, 84, 90, 100, 106, 107, 112, 114, 118
Bultmann, Rudolf 25n3, 54, 57, 70, 112, 117
- Caiaphas 24, 100
Covenant 29, 30, 37–38, 42, 49, 75, 85, 92, 95, 101, 103, 110, 113, 124
Cullmann, Oscar 11–12, 69n12
Culpepper, R. Alan 12, 58
- Darkness 30, 32–33, 37, 41, 42–43, 52, 56
David (king) 46, 80, 92–95, 101, 116
Dodd, C. H. 18, 24n1, 77, 89, 106, 111, 115
door 43–45, 73, 74, 90
- Evans, Craig 10, 91
- Father / πατήρ 28–29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 61, 66, 75, 78, 79, 86, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 102, 114
- fish 59, 64, 118–121
- Gaston, Lloyd 70, 75, 76
glorify / glory / δοξάζω / δόξα 28, 43, 52, 54–56, 59, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 89, 98, 99, 102, 103, 110, 114, 114–116, 123, 124
- Hays, Richard B. 1, 68, 69, 94, 122–127
Hear / ἀκούω 35–36, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 57, 88, 94, 97, 100, 101, 102, 110, 123
Hellenism/Hellenistic 2–6, 10, 42, 51
Hamid–Khani, Saeed 6n29
- “I am” 27n11, 32, 40–41, 42, 45, 47, 49, 68, 81, 92, 93, 95, 98, 99, 114, 117, 119, 123
- Jerusalem 44, 48, 69, 70, 71, 73, 79, 80, 81, 82, 100
Josephus 85n108
judge / judgment / κρίνω / κρίσις / κρίμα 30, 32, 35, 36, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 51, 55, 56–58, 59, 63, 66, 73, 90, 92, 93, 97, 107, 110, 111, 113, 129
- know / γινώσκω 93
Kysar, Robert 11n55, 108, 128
- Light 3, 30, 32, 33, 37, 41, 42–43, 48, 56, 66, 69
live / life / ζάω / ζωή 36, 38–40, 57, 62, 97, 99
love / ἀγαπάω / φιλέω 28, 32, 36–38, 39, 50, 56, 66
- Manning, Gary T. 1n4, 15–16, 26n8, 89n136
Moloney, Francis J. 11n55
- nations / ἔθνη 32–33, 38, 75, 92, 95, 101, 102, 113, 115, 116
Nicodemus 64, 104, 107, 108, 125
- Paraclete 16, 57, 60–61, 112–113
Peterson, Brian Neil 1n4, 15, 44–45, 65n55, 84, 99n188
Philo 3, 85n108
- resurrection 46–47, 55, 56, 57, 64, 68, 79, 82, 84, 95–103, 110, 124
Robbins, Vernon K. 7, 9, 25
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf 6, 52, 83, 106
send / ἀποστέλλω / πέμπω 34–35, 61, 66, 102, 123
shepherd 16, 39, 41, 44, 45–46, 89–95, 100, 101, 102, 103, 123, 124–26, 128
sign / σημείον 54, 55, 63–66, 95, 96, 110, 119
Spirit / πνεῦμα 16, 30, 31, 32, 39, 40, 45, 48, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60–63, 66, 67, 69, 79, 80, 83, 101, 103, 105–108, 113, 114, 124, 128
- Son of Man 16, 39, 46, 73, 77, 97, 101, 102, 109–112, 114, 115, 123, 126, 128

- Temple 28, 44, 55–57, 66, 67–84, 85, 86, 88,
 90, 95, 96, 100, 103, 107, 119, 120, 121, 123,
 124, 126
 Tenney, Merrill C. 29, 106, 107n18
 truth 3, 31, 32, 41, 44, 48–49, 51, 54, 55, 60, 61,
 64, 66, 68, 69, 79, 80, 113
 vine 16, 41, 48, 49, 66, 67, 69, 83, 117
 water 39, 40, 58–60, 61, 64, 66, 67, 74, 75, 80,
 83, 84–89, 103, 104–09, 119, 121, 123, 124,
 127
 way / ὁδός 41, 47–48, 66
 witness / μαρτυρέω / μαρτυρία 34, 35, 53–54,
 66, 94
 word / λόγος / ῥῆμα 38, 50–53, 56, 68, 75, 77
 world / κόσμος 3, 31, 32–34, 37, 38, 43, 54, 56,
 57, 66, 95, 96, 128

Index of Scripture and Other Ancient Writings

Genesis		80:8	117
7:11	77n59	80:17	109
28:10–17	77	89:4, 36	105n74
28:17	78	95:7	91
30:22	97	100:3	91
46:31–34	91	110:4	115n74
48:15	91	116:8	87
		128:15–16	87
Exodus	56	Proverbs	
3:14	41	4:23	87
17:1–7	87	5:15	87
39:33ff	76	18:4	87
40:34	76		
Leviticus		Isaiah	
11:32	108n26	4:4	108n26
14:8–9	108n26	5:1–7	117
Numbers		5:7	117
14:21, 28	39n54	9:6–7	115
19:12–19	108n26	11:12	102n206
27:17	91	12:3	80, 85
Deuteronomy		16:5	56n123
3:23ff	76	24:18	77n59
8:15	87	27:2–3	117
22:1	91	27:12–13	102n206
28:12	97	40:3	47
32:39	96	40:11	91
32:40	39n54	43:5	102n206
1 Samuel		43:20	87
2:6	96	44:3	87, 107n20, 108n22 and n26
17	91	44:3ff	107
2 Kings		46:3	116
5:7	96	48:21	87
Psalms		49:9–10	91
23	91	49:18	39n54
77:21	91	56:8	102n206
78:16	87	56:11	91
78:23	77n59	58:11	87
78:52, 70–72	91	63:11	91
80	69n11	63:19 (64:1 RSV)	77n59
80:1	91	Jeremiah	
		2:21	117
		3:15	91
		7:18	45

10:21	91	3:15	72
21:12	56n123	3:17	35-36, 53-54
22:24	39n54	3:17-19	52-53
23:1-8	91	3:17-21	58
25:34-38	91	3:19	40
31:8, 10	102n206	3:20	114
32:37	102n206	3:24	62
44:17-25	45	3:24-25	110
46:18	39n54	3:27	110
Ezekiel		4:3	65
1	43	4:4-15	110
1-3	16	4:9ff	110
1:1	16n75, 17n77, 72,	4:9-17	42
	77n59, 82	4:11, 16-17	59
1:1-28	55, 82	5:1ff	110
1:1-3:15	72	5:8	33
1:3	62n140, 76n51	5:16	42
1:4, 13, 26-28	43	5:17	35
1:12, 20-21	62	7:8-19	40
1:24	59	7:17	59
1:24-25	115	8-11	16, 74, 76n51, 82
1:26	109	8:1	62n140
1:28	55, 72	8:1ff	110
2:1	110	8:1-18	45
2:1-2	62	8:3	62, 72-73
2:1-7	52-53	8:4	72, 82
2:1-3:4	110	8:6	72-74
2:1-3:11	72	8:10-12	72
2:2	62	8:13	72n32
2:3	33n, 102	8:14	45, 73, 100n196
2:3-4	35	8:16	86
2:5	53	8:17	73
2:6-7	52-53	8:17-9:10	40
2:7	53-54	8:18	73
2:7-10	53	9:1-11	73-74
2:8	110	9:3	73
3:1-4	110	9:4, 6	65
3:4, 10-11	53	9:4-6	73
3:4-7	36	9:5	82
3:4-11	35, 113	9:6	82
3:4-27	52-53	10:4	55
3:7	62	10:18	73
3:10	35	10:19	55, 73
3:10-11	36	11:1, 24	62
3:10-15	62	11:4-5	110
3:12, 14	62	11:5	52-53, 62
3:14	62, 62n140	11:5-6	32
3:14-15	110	11:16	33
		11:17	102n206

Ezekiel (cont.)		18:8-28	40
11:17-21	82	18:21	30
11:19	37	18:21-32	40
11:20	30, 37	18:29	47
11:22-23	82	18:31	62
11:23	55, 73	18:32	40
12:1-7, 17-20	110	19	69n11
12:2	110	19:10	117
12:6	65	19:10-14	49
12:6, 11, 17ff	110	20:4	57
12:6-15	65	20:4ff	110
12:18-19	42, 59	20:9, 14, 22	38
12:21-28	53	20:11-21	40
13:1-16	45, 53	20:12, 20	65
13:5	45	20:12-20	65
13:17-23	45	21:7	59
13:9	41n59	21:11	110
13:10	26n8	21:11, 17	110
13:22	40	21:12	110
14:8	65	22:1ff	110
14:13	35, 42	22:2	57
14:21	35	22:15	116
15	16, 69n11, 117	22:25-31	45
15:1-5	117	22:30	45
15:1-8	49, 121n103	23:4-5, 31	48
15:2-6	117	23:16	35
16	28	23:23	41n59
16:3	28n17	23:24	58
16:5-8	37	23:36	57
16:9	59	23:40	35
16:19	42	23:49	41n59
16:22, 43	113	24:14	116, 125n11
16:59	57	24:15-24	110
16:60-63	37, 113	24:23	99n188
16:63	37	24:24	54, 110
17	14n65, 16	24:24, 27	65
17:1-10	117	24:24-27	65
17:1-16	59	24:25-27	110
17:2	117	27:35	99n188
17:5-21	49	28:22	55
17:7-8	117	28:23	35
17:9	117	28:24	41n59
17:12	117	28:25	102n206
17:14	30	29:16	41n59
17:15	35	31:1-32:31	59
17:17	62	32:7-8	43
17:24	116	33	123
18:8-23	101	33-48	123-124

33:1-9	36	36:25	14n68, 75
33:7	53	36:25-26	107, 124
33:9	123	36:25-27	11n57, 16n75, 40, 59,
33:9-19	40		62, 107
33:15-19	40	36:27	37
33:17, 20	47	36:28	37
33:30	123	36:29, 35	59
33:30-32	110	36:31	113
33:31	37	36:36	33, 116
33:31-32	36, 52, 110	37	16, 47, 93n163, 97n177,
34	16, 45, 45n76, 46,		100-101, 108n22,
	89-93, 92n157, 93n163,		111n46, 124
	100n196, 101-102,	37:1	62
	121n103, 123n6, 124	37:1-2	101
34:4-5	91	37:1-14	40, 98n186, 101, 110
34:5	93	37:4	16n75, 47, 100
34:8, 14	93	37:4-6	62, 101
34:10	91	37:4-10	36
34:11-13	93	37:7	102
34:11-16	92, 120	37:7, 10	102
34:12	43	37:7-8	101
34:13	93, 102n206	37:9	16n75, 63
34:14	93	37:9-10	101, 108n22, 113
34:14-15	92n158	37:11-14	101
34:14-16	45	37:12	16n75
34:15	42	37:13	97
34:15, 23	93	37:14	63
34:17-22	92	37:15-23	92-94, 102
34:18	59	37:15-24	101
34:20-22	93	37:19	92
34:23	10, 92-93	37:21	37
34:23ff	110	37:21-22	33, 102n206
34:23-24	44, 93-94	37:21-24	100n196
34:25	42, 93	37:22	33n
34:25-31	92	37:24	10, 46, 93
34:26	35, 42	37:24-28	95, 101, 110
34:27, 30	93	37:25	14n65, 113, 115-116
34:28	33	37:25, 27	92
34:29	42	37:25-28	102
35, 38-39	124n7	37:26	92
36	101, 108, 124	37:26-28	75
36:13-16	33n	37:28	32-33, 92, 126
36:17, 25ff	110	38-39	113
36:22-23	38	38:10	52
36:22-32	83	38:16	33
36:22-36	59, 74, 126	38:23	33, 114-115
36:23	33, 114-115	39:6	35
36:24	33, 102n206	39:7	32, 38

Ezekiel (cont.)

39:13, 39	55
39:15	65
39:23	32-33
39:25	37
39:28	33, 35, 102n206
40-46	79n73
40-48	15, 55, 70, 71, 73-74, 76n51, 82, 110, 124
40:1-43:1	73
40:2	72
42-48	44
43:1-3	72n32
43:1-5	73n41, 82
43:2	59
43:2-5	55, 73
43:5	62
43:6-46:24	73n41
43:7	73, 77
43:18-27	73
43:18-46:24	73
44:2	44
44:4	55
44:23	74
44:24	56n123
46:1	44
46:1-12	44
46:8	44
46:10	44
46:12	44
47	59n80, 88n134, 89n135
47:1	59, 74
47:1-2	89
47:1-9	85
47:1-11	80n81
47:1-12	16n75, 73n41, 80, 83, 85, 87, 120n97
47:1-19	59
47:2-9	74
47:2-10	75
47:3-9	59
47:5	88
47:8	120
47:8-10	120
47:9	88
47:9-10	16n75, 119
47:10	14n68, 74

47:10-11

59

47:12

59, 74

47:21-48:34

74

47:22-23

74

48:35

74, 121n103

Daniel

7:13-14

109

7:13-14:2

109

7:14

115n74

12:2

97n176, 98n186

12:2-3

97n176

Hosea

1:11

102n206

10

69n11

10:1

117

Joel

2:28-29

108n26

Micah

2:12

91

2:12-13

102n206

4:6-8

91

Zephaniah

2:9

39n54

3:20

102n206

Haggai

2:7ff

70n20

Zechariah

2:5-9

70n20

8:16

56n123

11:4-17

91

13:1

80, 85, 108n26

14:8

87

14:8ff

80, 85

Malachi

3:10

77n59

Matthew

3:16

77n59

21:13

78

Mark		2:13-22	56, 78, 79n74
1:10	77n59	2:16	28
1:17	78	2:18	78
		2:19	16, 68
Luke		2:19-21	69, 95
3:21	77n59	2:19-22	75, 77
19:46	78	2:20	79
		2:21	78-79, 81-83
John		2:22	50
1	16	2:23	64
1-4	68n4	2:25	31-32
1:1-3	52	3:1-10	11n57
1:4	38	3:1-15	39
1:4-5	52	3:1-16	69
1:5	43	3:2	64
1:6-8	35	3:3	106n15, 108
1:7, 19-23, 29-36	53	3: 5	14n67, 16n75, 106n12,
1:9	48		107n18, 108
1:10	31-32, 32n33	3:3-5	61
1:11	81	3:5	40, 58-59, 104, 105n4,
1:12	30		106n16, 108n24
1:14	28, 52, 55, 68, 75, 76,	3:6	60, 104, 108
	77, 82, 124	3:8	61
1:14, 17	48	3:10	107
1:15	52	3:14	55
1:17	68	3:15-16, 36	38
1:18	28, 52	3:16	37-39, 57
1:22	34	3:16, 36	30
1:23	10n49, 47	3:16-17	32
1:24	34	3:17	56, 69
1:26	59, 108n26	3:18	30, 56-57
1:26, 31, 33	58	3:18-19	57
1:32-33	60	3:19	32, 37, 56
1:33	60-61, 108n26	3:19-21	43
1:40-41	53	3:33	48
1:45	53	3:34	50-51, 53, 62n142, 69
1:49	53	3:35	28, 36-37
1:51	16n75, 17n77, 69, 77,	3:36	30, 38-39, 126n
	82-83	4:1-42	58n128
2	16	4:7-15	58
2-12	127	4:7-26	69
2:6-8	119	4:10	31, 59, 81n83
2:1-11	58, 68	4:10-11	40
2:11	54-55, 64, 124	4:13-14	16n75, 69
2:12-21	124	4:14	38-39, 59, 61, 126
2:13, 23	69	4:19-26	79
2:13-17	82	4:21-23	69

John (cont.)

John 4:21-24	79, 82	5:39	54, 127
4:23	83	5:39-40	39
4:23-24	48, 60, 82	5:41, 44	54
4:26	41	5:42	31, 37
4:32	31	5:43	115
4:37	50	5:47	50
4:39	50	5:50	35
4:41	50	5:57	39
4:46-54	64n54	6:1	120n101
4:48	65n154	6:1-14	64
4:50	50	6:4	69
4:50-53	38n50	6:5-59	42
4:54	64	6:15	42
5	96n173, 98-100,	6:15-21	64
103		6:26	64
5:1	69	6:27	42
5:1-8	58	6:27, 33	39
5:1-9	64, 69, 96	6:28-29	30
5:6	31	6:29	52
5:18	28, 46	6:32	48
5:19	52	6:35	30, 42, 86
5:19-20	96	6:40	30, 39
5:19-20, 36	103n207	6:44, 57	28
5:19-30	96	6:45	35
5:20	36-37	6:47	38
5:21	39, 46-47, 96, 102	6:48	42
5:21, 25-26	99n190	6:51	42
5:22	56, 58	6:51, 53	39
5:22-23	57, 97	6:51-57	39
5:23	28, 34, 46, 102	6:57	39
5:24	30, 36, 38-39, 46-47,	6:58	42
	50-51, 57, 97	6:60	50
5:24-25	39	6:63	39, 60-61
5:24-29	98n179, 111	6:63, 68	51
5:25	36, 57, 97, 102	6:64	31-32
5:25-28	16n75	6:69	31n31, 32
5:25-29	98, 100	7:1-14	69
5:26	38-39, 57	7:2	80
5:27	111	7:2, 37	69
5:27-29	46	7:3, 31	64
5:28-29	57, 97	7:7	32
5:29	46	7:14	80-81
5:30	34-35, 57, 102	7:17	31
5:31	48	7:18	55
5:36	28, 34, 54, 65, 69	7:24	56
5:37-38, 42	103n207	7:28	31, 48, 80
5:38	50, 69	7:29	31
		7:36, 40	50

7:37-38	84-86, 86n114, 86n116, 88	9:22	90n141
7:37-39	14n67, 16n75, 75n46, 80, 83, 84n101	9:24	54
7:38	40, 81n83, 83, 87-88	9:34	44, 90, 93
7:38-39	58, 60n132, 61, 124	9:35-38	90
7:39	30, 55, 59, 61, 89	9:39	32, 56
8:12	30, 33, 43	9:39-41	90
8:14	31, 48	10	16, 45-46, 89-90, 92n157, 93n163, 121n103, 125n12
8:15	57	10:1-2	44
8:16	57	10:1-9	43
8:16, 29, 54	114	10:1-10	44n73, 45
8:18	28, 54	10:1-18	89, 90n144, 95
8:19, 55	31	10:1-27	31
8:21	67n1	10:3	93
8:21, 24	114	10:3, 5, 14	93
8:21-24	52-53	10:4	99n190
8:23	32	10:4-5, 27	45
8:23, 28, 58	41	10:6	90
8:24	30	10:7-9	44
8:26	35, 48, 56	10:9	44, 93
8:28	31-32	10:10	38, 93
8:30-31	30n26	10:10, 28	45
8:31	50-51	10:11	44
8:31-32	51	10:11-13, 18	45
8:32	31, 48, 51	10:11, 14	45
8:36	48, 81	10:11, 15, 17	39
8:40, 45-46	48	10:12	93
8:42	34	10:15-17	38n50
8:42-47	51	10:16	10, 93, 102
8:43	50	10:19	50
8:44	48	10:19-29	90n144
8:47	35, 50	10:21	50
8:50	55, 57	10:22	82, 90n144
8:51	39	10:23	119
8:51-52	30, 50-51	10:24	94, 125
8:54	54	10:25	54, 115
8:55	30	10:25, 32, 37-38, 41	64
8:56-59	81	10:25, 37-38	65
8:58	81	10:25-27	45
8:59	81-82	10:25-30	93-94
9:1-7	58-59, 64	10:27-29	93
9:1-30	31	10:28	39
9:3-4, 16	64	10:28-29	45
9:4	43	10:30	28
9:5	43	10:35	50
9:7	34, 69	10:36	28, 41, 81, 95
9:16	64	10:38	93n162

John (cont.)

10:41	48	12:35-36	43
11	96, 98, 100, 102n206,	12:36	30, 43
	103	12:37	64
11:1-6	98	12:38	50
11:1-44	64	12:41	55
11:3	36	12:42	90n141
11:3-5	17n80	12:42-43	30n26
11:4	55, 98	12:43	37, 54
11:4, 40	55	12:46	30, 43
11:5	36	12:47	30, 32, 50,
11:7-14	98		56-57
11:9-10	30	12:47-48	36, 50
11:10-11	43	12:48	51, 56-57
11:20	100n196	12:49	28
11:21-22	98	13-17	103
11:23-24	98	13:1	32
11:24-25	46	13:1-11	103
11:25	39, 95, 99	13:3-12	58-59
11:26	30	13:7	31
11:28-32	99	13:11	14n68
11:31, 33	99n188	13:13	41
11:33	60	13:18	41
11:35	99	13:19	30, 41
11:38-40	99	13:21	60
11:40	102	13:23	36
11:41-42	99	13:30	60n132, 91n147,
11:43	47		119
11:43-44	47, 98-99	13:31	55
11:47-53	100, 103	13:31-32	55
11:48	69	13:33	47
11:49-50	100	13:34	37
11:50-52	33-34	13:35	33, 37
11:52	100, 102, 120	13:37-38	39
11:56	82	13:38	38n50
12	114	14	103n207
12:16	55	14:2	47
12:23	114	14:2-3, 16-18, 21-23, 27	103
12:23, 28	55	14:3	32, 55
12:23-32	55	14:5, 9	31
12:27-28	114	14:6	38, 47-48
12:28	55, 114	14:7	28, 31
12:28-29	115	14:9	47
12:31	32, 57	14:9-10, 18	52
12:32	115, 119	14:9-13	55
12:33	115	14:10	28, 34, 50-51
12:34	14n65, 115-116	14:10-12	103n207
12:35	30	14:11	65
		14:12	30, 65

14:13-14	116, 125n11	16:27	36
14:14	116	16:28	32
14:15	36-37, 50	17:1	55
14:15, 21	30	17:2	39
14:15-17, 26	112n50, 113n65	17:3	31-32, 39, 48
14:16, 26	60	17:4	55
14:16-17	32, 112n50	17:4-5	55
14:16-17, 26	60	17:5	55
14:16-20	61	17:6	50
14:17	31, 48, 60-61	17:6, 14, 17	50
14:18-25	51	17:8	48, 50
14:19	32, 39	17:10	55
14:21, 23	37	17:11	28, 32
14:21-24	103n207	17:13	32
14:23	36, 50-51	17:14	32, 50
14:23-24	30, 50	17:17	51
14:24	28, 35, 50-51	17:17-19	103, 126
14:26	60-61	17:18	34
14:28	37	17:20	50
15	14n65, 16, 49, 117	17:21-23	33
15:1	48, 69, 117	17:23	31
15:1-6	117	17:24	37, 55
15:4-8	83	17:26	32
15:1-10	121n103	18:5, 8	41
15:3	51	18:9, 32	50
15:7	50-51	18:16-17	43
15:8	55	18:37	48
15:9	37	18:38	48
15:10	50	19:8, 13	50
15:12	37	19:19	54
15:13	37, 38n50, 39	19:30	60-61
15:20	30, 50	19:34	59, 61, 83, 89
15:24	65	19:35	48, 57
15:25	50	20	16
15:26	48, 54, 60-61	20:1-10	64
15:26-27	112n50, 113n65	20:2	36
16:2	90n141	20:14	31
16:7	48, 60	20:19, 26	43
16:7-8	61	20:21	28, 34
16:7-11	112n50, 113n65	20:21-22	103
16:8-11	57	20:22	16n75, 60, 61
16:11	32	20:23	16
16:12-14	60n133	20:28	28n13
16:13	60	20:30-31	63
16:13-15	112n50	20:31	29, 39, 121n103
16:14	55, 61	21	121
16:19	31-32	21:1-11	16, 118
16:23	61	21:1-14	59n, 118n85, 120n96

John (cont.)		22:1–2	88
21:6–11	64	22:17	88
21:9	118n85		
21:9, 13	41	Apocrypha	
21:11	14n68, 118, 119, 120	Sirach	
21:15–17	36–37, 92	24:8–10	77
21:16–17	45	24:30–33	87
21:17	31, 93		
21:23	50	Tobit	
21:24	48, 54	13:10–12; 15:5–7	70
21:25	128		
		Psalms of Solomon	
Acts		3:12	98n186
7:56	77n59		
10:11	77n59	Ecclesiasticus	
		36:18	70n20
1 John			
5:6–8	105n4	2 Maccabees	
		1:27; 2:7, 18	102n106
Revelation			
15:5	76n53	Other Jewish Literature	
16:17–19:10	1n3	Sukk. 1.1–2.4; 4.9; 5.3–1;	
19:11	77n59	b. Sukk. 5.48b; 5.53a;	
19:17–21	1n3	5.55a; Peshikta Rabbati	85n108
20:7–10	1n3		